September 2021

Response to Planning Applications Nos. **2021/62/93006/E, 2021/65/93007/E** and **2021/62/92969/E**

Dear Ms Bearcroft,

We recognise that the majority of this site has been approved for housing in the Kirklees Local Plan. However, we object to the three planning applications stated above and the applications should be withdrawn or refused permission. We outline our reasons as follows.

We will refer at times to **Proposed Site Plan** drawing no. (20)001A by Orange Design Studio, application no. 2021/62/93006/E, document id.886085.

We also bring to your attention another **Proposed Site Layout,** drawing no.3381/2 in a report by Lithos Consulting, application no.2021/62/93006/E, document id.886024 in 'Supporting Information'. This Lithos drawing is dated 03/06/21, but interestingly in the top right-hand corner, states it is a reproduction of a Watson Batty drawing dated 08/10/18. These were the previous architects who worked for Farnley Estates/Radcliffe's on Beech Farm, Park Farm and the Kirklees Local Plan. Therefore, we assume this is the layout which relates to pre-application discussions and the Kirklees letter of 28th May 2019, as references to plot numbers, site boundary etc. in this letter are consistent. We note that you were personally not involved in the pre-application discussions, but no doubt you will be fully aware of the contents of said Kirklees letter.

The earlier site plan still has 21 homes but with a different layout and plot numbers. We have added this drawing here to help in comparing the two layouts.

Later in our comments we have offered an alternative layout.



Sloping Site, Layout, Design and Materials

Paragraphs 6.14, 6.15, 6.16 and 6.19 Peacock+Smith Planning Statement states that the proposals will "maintain and enhance", "use sympathetic materials and vernacular architectural style", "preserved and enhanced", "sensitive and harmonious", "high quality refurbishment" and "a sensitive scheme that provides a sympathetic development in keeping with the rustic character of Farnley Tyas".

We disagree wholeheartedly that these applications adhere to those principles and consider the proposals unacceptable, and we detail our issues as follows.

We bring to your attention that the Proposed Site Plan, drawing no. (20)001A, does not show the proposed roof lights on any of the listed buildings. We also believe Plot 9 is missing its roof lights. Is this sloppy draughting or deliberate to avoid showing the plethora of roof lights?

The existing bus shelter is shown as within the development site and it appears to remain in its present position. However, it is unclear who will own/maintain this public facility, this needs to be clarified.

The existing ground slopes significantly with the highest point in the south-west corner of the site, near the church. There is approx. a 5m height difference

between this point and to the east at Farnley Road and approx. a 4.5m height difference to the north at The Village.

There is an inadequate amount of detail on the proposed finished ground floor levels of the converted listed buildings, levels of the access road, parking areas and gardens. It is therefore difficult to understand how the new build fully relates to the existing buildings on site and to neighbouring houses, the public right of way and the surrounding landscape.

There are a number of key views into the development that have been highlighted in the various supporting documents submitted with the application by the developer. The proposed layout and height of the new houses will have a negative impact on the Conservation Area and the views of the historic core of the village.

These views are;

- When entering the village from Woodsome Road
- From near The Golden Cock looking into the site from The Village
- From the northwest, near the church, along The Village
- Directly from the Church and Public Right of Way to the west of the site
- From the southwest on the Public Right of Way
- From the south on Farnley Road looking towards the church and farmstead

There are significant issues with the size, height and location of the proposed houses.

Plot 13 - proposed ground floor level is the same as existing farmyard, house is 8.36m high and the ridge line will be 3.5m higher than the adjacent existing barn!
Plots 11 and 12 - are 8.05m high
Plot 10 - is 8.36m high, proposed ground floor level is 1m above existing ground level, 2.2m higher than the existing adjacent barn and will also be approx. 3m higher than the existing level at Farnley Road (New Lane Terrace)
Plot 10 - will dominate existing adjacent buildings to the east of the site, 51/53 The Village, New Lane Barn and 1-4 New Lane Terrace.

Proposed ground floor levels for Plots 9 and 10 are approx. 1m higher than existing ground levels. The ground floors of these new houses will be at the same level as the bedrooms of the adjacent homes one of which is listed, 51/53 The Village.

Plot 9 is 5 metres closer to 51/53 The Village than the existing east wall of the single storey agricultural barn. There are no ridge levels shown but by comparing the house designs we estimate this house will be approx. 8m high and with the proposed orientation will have 2 floors of multiple windows overlooking 51/53 The Village and New Lane Barn. This will have a dominating effect and greatly reduce the visual and residential amenity of these existing properties. Plot 9 will also dominate the adjacent listed building the Old Dairy.

Plots 10-13 will dominate the the view from the south on Farnley Road. We have included an impression showing before and after. We have highlighted Tree T4 which is proposed to be removed. See later for more details on trees.



The southern elevation of Plots 10-13 is densely packed with no space between houses. This view of the village is visible from miles around and has the appearance of a wall of stone/slate/glass which is entirely inappropriate in this location. We are concerned with the large amount of glass and issues of light pollution.

Therefore, the site, scale, position and orientation must be revised.

Retain tree T4, reduce the scale and significantly lower ground and ridge levels of Plots 10-13. Change the design to match the look of the existing agricultural barns which are prevalent to the existing key view. Remove or pull back Plot 10 to the west away from adjacent houses, some of which are listed.

It is proposed to use tumbled & dyed stone walls and imitation stone slate roofing. We consider this will be detrimental to the character of the village centre. Every new build house impacts on at least one of the following important aspects; the views from within the village, the view from the south, the setting of the listed buildings within the site, the setting of the listed church, the setting of adjacent listed buildings and proximity to non-listed historic buildings which are at least 120 years old, all of which lie within the Farnley Tyas Conservation Area. Therefore, we recommend that these are changed to reclaimed stone and slates to better complement existing weathered stone barns and houses.

This is the last remaining farmstead in the village and in a prominent position in the village centre. The proposed house design is more suitable to a suburban setting therefore we think there should be a different approach to the design to be more like the farmstead which is being removed completely. With a look more like the existing agricultural barns with timber facades.

Listed Buildings and Heritage Assets.

We agree with Historic England, The Georgian Group, West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service and the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings and their respective reasons and we object to the proposed renovations of the 4 listed buildings and the demolition of the 19century stone farmhouse as detailed below.

An up-to-date Historic Building Appraisal must be provided relating to the application scheme as submitted, taking account of the NPPF, 2019 Local Plan policies and PPG Guidance as well as the concerns raised by heritage bodies referenced above. The Historic Environment Appraisal prepared by Waterman in 2016 is sorely out of date.

In Kirklees' letter of 28 May 2019 in respect of the request for pre-application advice sections 1 and 6.3 it is noted that the applicant states that the "curtilage listed building" should be demolished and rebuilt to facilitate the new estate road and that justification needs to be clearly set out. We see no reference in the proposals to the careful rebuilding of what we believe is an unlisted 19century stone farmhouse. Just a terrible attempt to supposedly recreate the scale and features on Plot 17. Not even proposing to use any reclaimed materials! We do not find any justification in the submission.

We prefer to see this building remain in its current location and be refurbished, but if justification can be made for removal then this building should be carefully taken down stone by stone and rebuilt exactly as is, in a suitably visible location.

There is insufficient information regarding the renovations of the listed buildings including a lack of detail about proposed ground floor and ridge levels.

The Heritage Environment Appraisal (HEA) by Waterman, dated 2016, has been submitted by Peacock+Smith in their Planning Statement but in paragraph 6.10 they confusingly state that "…this does not form part of this application….". Yet in paragraphs 6.11, 6.12 and 6.13 Peacock+Smith are referencing this HEA to support the proposals. So, is this report part of the applications or not? If not, then a Heritage assessment must be carried out and submitted.

There is no information about what is happening to the heritage assets identified as 7 and 8 in Appendix/Figure D of the HEA. What is proposed for these stone walls and how will they be retained/repaired? The wall along The Village is presumably being rebuilt to accommodate the new access, we draw your attention to Figure 21 and the historic gate posts which should be rebuilt in the

same place in the new wall. Also, we bring to your attention an historic gate post within Heritage Asset no.8 the stone wall forming the boundary with the public right of way, PROW Kir59/10.

We think the conversion of the listed barn ID.1392518 Plots 1-4, Manor Barn, adjoining 55 The Village, should be reduced from 4 homes to 2. Retain and rebuild the two existing lean-tos to accommodate 2 cars each, in the same locations and style. Garden boundaries to the east should be changed to 1m high stone wall. These changes would provide a more sympathetic conversion and reduce the number of new openings in the walls and roof.

The conversion of the Old Dairy ID.1392517 Plots 6-8, should be reduced from 3 to 2 homes and be single storey only. Remove proposed trees in gardens of Plots 7 and 8. Change the garden boundaries to the east to 1m high stone walls when viewed from 'outside' and reduce garden level by approx. 1m i.e., garden wall from within will be approx. 2m high.

The gardens for Plots 5 and 6 need to be revised, it is messy as proposed with how the 2 plots are separated. 1.8m high timber fences are proposed in a very small space which abuts the new parking for Plots 6-8. Recommend that 1m high stone walls would be a much-improved solution.

We are concerned about the capabilities and experience of the Architect and Developer and whether they have the skills and experience to work on such intricate renovations of listed buildings. It should be noted that on Park Farm there was only one listed building and the contractor cut into and nearly destroyed a key feature, a 1693 dated stone to insert a stone lintel. How can Kirklees ensure that the listed buildings are completed once any revised plans are approved? What happens if the developer doesn't finish the conversions; sells the listed buildings to someone else and focuses on the easier task of building new houses or ceases trading without works being completed. We want to see appropriately worded conditions and/or a Section 106 Obligation entered into to prevent this from happening. All conditions must be transferable to any developer other than the proposer.

We want a condition/S106 Obligation stating that NO new build houses can be occupied until ALL listed building renovations are substantially complete. We note condition 20 on the Park Farm development application no. 2015/65/90759/E which said the same, however this was disregarded by the Developer and was not enforced when Kirklees were informed. Therefore, substantially complete needs to be well defined. We recommend that substantially complete is defined as all listed buildings should be structurally sound with all walls and roofs repaired/rebuilt as necessary, damp proofing completed and with new windows and doors installed therefore ensuring that the buildings are weathertight.

Green Belt

Housing Site HS198 is part of Kirklees Local Plan (KLP) and the boundary of the site is clearly shown on the KLP map. The southern boundary of the housing allocation abuts the Green Belt. The description of HS198 in Housing Allocations of KLP makes no reference to extending the development into Green Belt land.

The submitted Location Plan drawing no. (EX)002 identifies the application site boundary with a red line, includes land which contains the two Barns beyond the southern site development boundary as shown on the Proposed Site Layout (20)001. What is the proposed use of this Green Belt land? Its openness must be protected.

Kirklees Local Plan Policy LP58 - Garden extensions "Proposals to change the use of land in the Green Belt to a domestic garden will not normally be permitted".

On the south side of the development the new houses are built right up to the existing boundary.

We note that in Kirklees letter 28/05/21 section 6.3 states that the new buildings are too close to the Green Belt boundary. However, in the proposals now submitted instead of pulling the development back from the boundary as Kirklees state, the new houses stay in the same place and to accommodate gardens the development extends approx. 7-10 metres into the Green Belt. This is unacceptable, the finished development should not extend at all into Green Belt.

The existing Green Belt boundary must be defined and established now before any works take place. The boundary is easily identified at present using existing features on the ground, but these will disappear during the demolition. So, the boundary needs to be properly surveyed with accurate measurements tying it to features outside the site boundary so it can be reinstated after development.

There is no mention in Peacock+Smith Planning Statement that the finished development extends into Green Belt, only paragraph 3.9 stating that removal of the two barns "will serve to create a more easily-defined boundary ….resulting in a tidier and more contained site". The proposed boundary, whilst we acknowledge is a straight line, is arbitrary and does not have any dimensions defining its finished position. Paragraph 4.13 makes no reference to the many objections to encroachment of the finished houses and instead misses the point and states the extension is there to include existing agricultural barns.

Trees

It is unacceptable that the proposals are to remove 2 trees.

There are 3 mature sycamore trees on the site, all within the Conservation Area, tree T2 is subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). It is next to the existing Sub Station and proposed to remain in place.

Tree ref: T1, next to T2, will be removed to allow for a new access into the development. How will this be achieved without damaging the roots of T2 as surely the roots will be intertwined.

Removal of Tree ref: T4 to locate a new house, Plot 10. This is in a prominent position in the south-east corner of the site and has a strong visual impact when approaching the village from Storthes Hall on Farnley Road. In JCA's report T4 is identified as being in Good Physiological and Structural Condition; Category B-Retention Desirable. No justification is given for its removal.

We draw your attention again to the Proposed Site Layout, drawing no.3381/2 in a report by Lithos Consulting. In particular we highlight that this layout is able to retain tree T4 and still accommodate a house nearby (Plot 13 on this layout).

We note in section 6.5 of Kirklees letter of 28/05/2019 the statement "There are protected/mature trees on the site which would be retained as part of any development scheme". This has obviously been ignored by the developer.

Therefore, we recommend that the layout is revised to avoid the removal of these 2 trees.

Location Plan

We recommend that the boundary of the site is redrawn to include the unfinished access from Farnley Road. See point 4 in Highways below.

Highways

1. The two existing entrances on the north-east of the site should not be used for construction traffic or for any access to the completed development, other than to maintain the existing vehicular access to Nos 55 and 63 The Village.

2. Currently parking is allowed on both sides of The Village. It is recommended that double-yellow lines are installed on the south side of The Village to ensure clear lines of site for the proposed visibility splays. The developer should contribute to the costs.

3. It is recommended that the speed limit is reduced to 20mph and traffic calming measures installed on this section of The Village. This could be part of a Village wide scheme and introduce similar at the four entrances into the village on Honley Road, Woodsome Road, Farnley Road and Thurstonland Road/Butts Road. Two of these roads incorporate pedestrian and/or vehicular access into the school, a third has a blind narrow bend.

4. No construction traffic or access to the development should be via the unfinished access from Farnley Road. This access was part of approved application 2013/91988. The access road has never been completed and the barns were never built. The visibility splays, drop kerbs and planting scheme are incomplete. This access road should be removed and made good as part of this development.

PROW Kir59/10

The west boundary of the site is currently made up a mixture of historic stone walls of differing heights, agricultural barn walls, farm gates and fences. There is insufficient detail to explain what will be the design, height and materials of the boundary of the public right of way. Part of this boundary was identified as a heritage asset in the HEA by Waterman referred to previously. We think that before any works start there needs to be a detailed record with photographs and the final proposals agreed with Kirklees Conservation Officer and Historic England.

We are concerned about the stability of the right of way and safety of users during demolition and construction. Note that the farmyard is up to 1m lower in many places along the shared boundary with the right of way. It is imperative that a method statement is submitted to explain at all stages of work how the right of way will remain open, safety will be guaranteed and its integrity maintained.

Environmental

It is unclear how extensive the surveys have been to identify potentially dangerous materials. The site has been a working farm with associated activities for more than 350 years.

We are concerned about possible leakage below ground of fuel, fertiliser, chemicals and animal waste etc. over the years. There needs to be a method statement agreed as to how suspect materials will be identified and safely removed and disposed of off-site.

The various agricultural and residential buildings have been used and adapted over the same time span. We are therefore concerned with the possible existence of asbestos and other unacceptable materials. Additional surveys need to be undertaken and again a method statement agreed as to how suspect materials will be safely removed and disposed of off-site.

Lighting

There is a total of 62 lighting bollards proposed, 11 around the car parking at the site entrance plus 51 more throughout the development. No specification is provided. They are proposed to be 60W LED, which seems incredibly

bright. Some bollards are within private gardens, therefore it is confusing as to who will own/maintain the lighting.

There is too much lighting and we are concerned about light pollution within the site and affecting adjacent residences. Bats and birds are evident in and around the site. Will the lighting impact upon the wildlife? The scheme needs to be reviewed and a lot more detail provided.

Adoption by Kirklees

It is unclear which, if any, parts of the development have been proposed to be adopted by Kirklees and the Water, Gas and Electricity Providers. This needs to be clarified. The obvious items are utilities, foul and surface water drainage, highways and lighting.

Alternative Layout

We recommend the following changes to the proposed layout which we believe would result in a better development.

1. The conversion of the listed barn ID.1392518 Plots 1-4, Manor Barn, adjoining 55 The Village should be reduced from 4 homes to 2. Rebuild the two existing lean-tos to accommodate 2 cars each, in the same locations and style. The north one with stone walls and wood garage doors and the south one with stone walls, oak framing, no doors in a loggia style. Garden boundaries to the east to be changed to 1m high stone wall.

These changes have the following advantages.
a) Retains the character of the west elevation of this barn.
b) This reduces the number of spaces required in the open car parking area.
c) Bin storage can then be less visible from The Village and hidden by these lean-tos.
d) Halve the number of roof lights required.
e) Much improved key view when entering the village on Woodsome Road, and in keeping with the existing stone wall which frames the barn.
f) Much improved key views from the west and east along The Village.

2. The conversion of the Old Dairy ID.1392517 Plots 6-8, should be reduced from 3 to 2 homes. Remove proposed trees in gardens of Plots 7 and 8. Change garden boundaries to the east to 1m high garden stone walls when viewed from‘ outside’ and reduce garden level by approx. 1m i.e. garden wall from within will be approx. 2m high. The renovation should be ground floor only.

These changes have the following advantages.
a) Reduces the size of the car parking area to the west.
b) Reducing by one home can result in a smaller garden area to the east and thereby facilitate suitable vehicle turning for 55 The Village.

c) Sunken garden with stone wall and no trees will reduce the impact and intrusion upon adjacent listed buildings 51/53 and 55 The Village.
d) Keeping to a single storey will reduce the impact upon adjacent listed buildings 51/53 and 55 The Village.
e) Reducing from 3 to 2 units should give enough ground floor area for single storey dwellings. Note that there are no single storey homes in this development.
f) Dramatic reduction in roof lights.

3. Plot 9 should be single storey and of a design that matches the existing agricultural barn style on the existing location i.e. wooden walls. The house should be moved further away from the boundary with 51/55 The Village. The orientation of the house and/or window arrangement should be changed and the proposed ground and ridge levels be lowered.

These changes have the following advantages.
a) A single storey home and of a design that matches the existing agricultural barn style together with reduced height and pulled back to the west would reduce the impact, intrusion and overlooking of 51/53 and 55 The Village.
b) Provide a single storey home for people with accessibility issues.
c) Retain the existing relationship between an agricultural barn and the adjacent listed Old Dairy.

4. Retain tree T4, reduce the scale and significantly lower ground and ridge levels of Plots 10-13. Change the design to match the look of the existing agricultural barns which are prevalent to the existing key view. Pull back Plot 10 to the west away from adjacent houses, some of which are listed.

These changes have the following advantages.
a) Retain the existing visual appearance of barns and of a farmstead style.
b) The tree is significant to the key view from the south.
c) Retains a mature tree which surely contributes to Kirklees vision of sustainability and will contribute more to carbon capture than small trees the developer is proposing.
d) Reducing scale and building heights and changing the layout will reduce the domination of existing adjacent houses.

We refer again to the drawing **Proposed Site Layout,** drawing no.3381/2 in a report by Lithos Consulting. Plots 13-16 on this drawing indicates a more suitable layout, however the relationship between the garages and houses shown here would need to be reconsidered to provide an acceptable view from the south.

5. Plots 16 and 17 change into a terrace of 4-5 houses. Stepped in heights to take into account the sloping site.

This change has the following advantage.
a) Could be more affordable homes and help to offset the reduction of units in points 1 and 2 above.

6. Demolish carefully and re-build existing stone farmhouse in the location of Plot 17.

This change has the following advantage.
a) Retains the heritage asset and improves a key view looking into the development from The Village.

7. Retain tree T1. With less car parking spaces as result of recommendation 1 above, then move the proposed entrance a little further to the east so that tree T1 can be accommodated.

These changes have the following advantages.
a) Helps to 'soften 'the impact of the new houses by creating a larger screen, than tree T2 alone, for the key view from the north-west part of The Village.
b) Retains a mature tree which surely contributes to Kirklees vision of sustainability and will contribute more to carbon capture than small trees the developer is proposing.
c) Opportunity to increase the size of the Public Open Space.

8. Possibility to convert Plot 5, Yew Tree Barn, into 2 units. There is an existing ground level difference of approx. 1.5m between the north and south sides of the barn. Current proposal doesn't address how this will be resolved internally. Unfortunately, this would require another 2 parking spaces, but if the Old Dairy is reduced to 2 units then the 2 spaces that would have been allocated to the Old Dairy could be reinstated.

These changes have the following advantages.
a) To add another home to the total number and offset the reduction in units from points 1 and 2 above.
b) Help resolve a design/level issue on Plot 5.

BROAD POLICY CONSIDERATIONS AND GUIDANCE

At Section 5 of Peacock and Smith's Statement, reference is made to relevant policies. Drawing out the most significant failures of the scheme as submitted.

- Kirklees LP11-Meeting the Council's affordable housing requirement should be addressed now and provision of suitable units built into the proposals.

LP24-Good design-the form, scale and layout notably fail to respect and enhance the character of the townscape, heritage assets and landscape.

-LP24-Crime- the comments of the Designing Out Crime Officer dated 3rd September should be addressed but having full regard for the impact on the overall appearance and heritage assets both from outside and within the site.

LP24 and LP33-Enhancement of the Natural Environment- This is not achieved especially with the proposed felling of 2No. trees protected by being within the Conservation Area.

LP35 and LP35-Heritage Assets- the requirement to preserve and enhance is far from met.

-NPPF Para 126 stresses the need for good design. The scheme fails!

NPPF Para 130 requires that development adds to the overall quality of the area, is visually attractive and sympathetic to local character and history. Failed.

NPPF Para 134-permission should be refused for development that is not well designed.

NPPF Paras 194, 197, 199-203 relate to proposals affecting heritage assets.

The respect required is not achieved.

Kirklees' Housebuilders Design Guide- the requirement for new housing development to be high quality is sorely missed.

Though not referred to in Peacock and Smith's Statement, the application site includes land in the Green Belt, both proposed gardens and land presently occupied by farm buildings whose use following demolition is not specified. Use of the land as gardens would conflict with the need to respect the essential character and fundamental aim of the Green Belt which is its openness and permanence-NPPF para 137.

Nor does the Statement address Kirklees LP58 re garden extensions- not normally permitted and no very special circumstances have been shown to exist.

It is considered that any decision made on the basis of the current submission should be a refusal because of failure to respect the above policies and guidance.

Conditions

We hope that the planning applications do not get approved but if they do or are re-submitted in the future then we want any approval to have the following conditions/S106 requirements attached.

1. No parking by construction traffic and workers on the PROW or the public highway. The village cannot facilitate the increased street parking. All parking must be kept within the development site. Perhaps the developer can pay the pub to accommodate some parking.

2. New entrance to be constructed first before any works start. This will enable works vehicles to enter/exit safely.

3. No construction traffic or access to the development should be via the unfinished access from Farnley Road. See Highways point 4 above. This access road should be removed and made good as part of this development.

4. The public right of way must remain open and safe to use at all times.

5. There are two existing accesses to the north-east, one to Manor Barn yard and No.63 The Village, the other to The Reading Rooms and No.55 The Village. These should not be used for construction traffic or parking and kept accessible at all times.

6. NO new build houses can be occupied until ALL listed building renovations are substantially complete. "Substantially complete" should be clearly defined to avoid confusion and aid planning enforcement if breached.

7. The site slopes onto the Village, therefore there is the possibility of water run-off onto the public highway. Recommend frequent cleaning of the surrounding public highway and the inclusion of a cleaning facility on site before vehicles exit the site.

8. The site is in the village centre with many neighbouring houses, the church and the pub therefore working hours and site activities need to acknowledge this and minimise disruption. We require the following to be put in place before work starts;

- No working on Sundays and Bank Holidays
- No working on significant C of E religious festivals. Dates to be agreed with the Church.
- No noisy construction activities during baptism, wedding and funeral services. Process and prior notice periods to be agreed with the Church.
- Weekday working hours are not before 8am and no later than 5pm or sunset whichever is the earliest
- Saturday working hours are not before 9am or after 12pm
- Noisy activities must be carried out within the working hours above. Some homes are within the site or as close as 1 metre to the site boundary. Additional details may need to be agreed with Kirklees Environmental Services.
- A number of properties/landowners have shared boundaries or party walls with the development. Surveys must be undertaken to agree current condition and appropriate temporary and permanent works to protect these boundaries. Post works surveys must be undertaken and remedial action undertaken by the developer as necessary at their cost.
- Method statement for the demolition works to be agreed before work commences.
- The site is elevated and exposed to the prevailing winds so;
    - No burning of any material at anytime on site. Note that there have been occurrences on the previous farm redevelopments.

- Dust from demolition, ground works and other activities must not cause environmental issues or restrict residents carrying out normal household/garden activities. Details need to be agreed with Kirklees Environmental Services.

9. If Kirklees do not consider a change to the boundary of the site to include the unfinished access from Farnley Road, then we want a condition that this access road be removed and made good as part of this development. This access was part of approved application 2013/91988 and has never been completed and the 2 proposed barns were never built.

Summary

We know that the majority of this site is designated for housing in the Kirklees Local Plan, however the current proposals are unacceptable and we object to any approval of the applications.

We consider the key issues with the proposals are;

- the sloping site, proposed layout and height of the new houses will unduly dominate existing adjacent buildings on The Village and New Lane Terrace.
- listed buildings and heritage assets need to be sympathetically converted to enhance the Conservation Area, there is insufficient detail to determine the proposals as they stand
- the removal of 2 mature sycamore trees, particularly the one in the south-east corner of the site which has a strong visual impact when approaching the village from Storthes Hall on Farnley Road
- encroachment into the Green Belt, the new houses built up to the existing site boundary with gardens taking Green Belt land
- proposed design, size, layout and materials of the new houses is critical to the setting of the village centre due to;
    - the proximity and/or affect on the setting of the listed buildings within and adjacent to the east of the site and the church to the west
    - the view from the south will be dominated by the new houses
    - the view from The Village from the east and west into the site
    - the view from the church and Public Right of Way to the west of the site
    - the view when entering Farnley Tyas from Woodsome Road

We have proposed an alternative layout and design which we hope will be valuable in preparing a revised plan.

We have included conditions to be attached to any future approval of, we hope, different proposals.

Due to the unique characteristics of the site it is our view that these applications should be referred to the planning committee and that committee members must visit the site prior to any decision.

We have attached the drawing and image contained herein if it helps to put our response onto your website.

Yours sincerely,

Farnley Tyas Community Group Committee