

Planning Applications 2021/62/92969/E, 2012/62/93006/E and 2021/65/93007/

Dear Ms Bearcroft,

I wish to register my objection to the 3 planning applications above.

I am happy for my submission to be entered on the website but I would like to have my name and address removed.

There are a number of issues with the current proposals and these are;

- The removal of two mature trees
- The unnecessary incursion into Green Belt
- Roads and footpaths
- The unsympathetic conversion of the listed buildings
- The layout, design and materials of the new build houses
- The sloping site and the impact on existing residences

Trees

It is unacceptable to remove 2 mature trees which will have hundreds of years of life remaining. Whilst I understand that the developer is proposing to plant some new, small trees, there aren't any calculations by the developer to compare the carbon capture of these large mature trees with the small replacements.

How can tree T1 be removed without significant damage to the root system of tree T2 which is subject to a TPO? These trees are so close together that the roots must be intertwined. Tree T4 is in a prominent position and a key part of the view when approaching the village from the south.

I can't see any justification, the developer wants them removed to facilitate the new road access and a new house Plot 10.

The site should be redesigned to accommodate these two trees. I note that there seems to have been a previous plan, I refer to *Proposed Site Layout*, a drawing in a report submitted by Lithos Consulting, which has been reproduced from an earlier layout dated 8th October 2018. This clearly shows keeping tree T4 and what was then *Plot 13* moved away to allow the tree to stay.

The site plan needs not be revised to retain these two trees.

Surely these proposals contravene Kirklees Sustainability Objectives, it is all well and good having fine words but we as individuals and you our Council must take action and here is a good example to demonstrate your conviction.

Green Belt

I refer again to *Proposed Site Layout*, a drawing in a report submitted by Lithos Consulting, which clearly shows 4 houses and their gardens, *Plots 13-16*, on the southern edge of the development within the site boundary with NO encroachment.

In the Kirklees Local Plan, housing site HS198 and the map clearly show the site boundary of any development being coincidental with the Green Belt boundary and no further.

The proposals encroach into land designated as Green Belt. This is unacceptable and there is no justification that exceptional circumstances exist to allow this to happen.

Roads and Footpaths

The new access road needs to be moved a little to the north-east so that tree T2 can remain.

I am concerned that sight lines will be compromised when exiting onto the Village if vehicles are allowed to park on the south side of the street. This can happen if there are busy church services and events at the school or pub. I recommend that maybe double yellow lines should extend as far as necessary to ensure exiting the development can be done safely.

I think this should be part of a general review of parking and the speed of vehicles through the village. For example, at school drop-off and pick-up times, Honley Road can have a long line of parked cars. Maybe introducing a length of double yellow lines long enough for a vehicle leaving the village to safely give way to one approaching. Also, the area at the junction of Honley Road/Butts Road/The Village can be quite dangerous if vehicles are parked nearby on the north side of the road when entering the village from Honley. I think the village needs a 20mph zone combined with traffic calming measures at the 4 main entry points into the village.

The public right of way shares the western site boundary. The details of the new proposed boundary lack detail, there are level differences along this boundary which currently consists of stone wall, barn walls, gates and fences. I note in section 6.3 of a Kirklees letter, dated 28th May 2019, which confirmed in pre-application discussions that the developer should submit a full landscaping plan which would include details of the work to the boundaries. Also, I think a method statement needs to be part of any submission to clearly detail the existing condition and features and the temporary and permanent works, whilst ensuring that the footpath remains open and safe to users at all times.

There should be no parking of construction deliveries, materials or workers on the public roads in the village, the public right of way or the two existing accesses on the north-east of the site.

The incomplete access road off Farnley Road and the small paddock between that and the south of the site should not be used as a permanent access to the development or for construction traffic, storage or parking. This was part of planning application no. 2013/91988 for access to 2 barns which were never built and the accessway is not complete or comply with the conditions attached.

Listed Buildings and Heritage Assets

I agree with the responses submitted by Historic England, Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings and the Georgian Group, the proposals are completely unacceptable and there is insufficient information to clearly understand the renovation works.

It is disappointing to see the complete demolition of the existing old stone farmhouse. Surely it can be saved and renovated for future use. I understand that the current proposals propose demolition to facilitate the new estate road, but why can't the design be revised so that the house can stay in position. Although not my preference but as an alternative, surely it could be carefully rebuilt say, in the area of proposed Plot 17. Again, I refer to the Kirklees letter section 6.3, which states that justification must be made to demolish this heritage asset and that even if it is, then this farmhouse should be re-built.

The proposals include some significant design issues. The 1.8m wooden fences are inappropriate in all the proposed locations and either 1m stone walls or metal railings need to be considered as alternatives. One of the key views, acknowledged in various reports in the application, is the one entering the village from the north-east on Woodsome Road. To see a solid view of fencing would completely hide the ground floor of the listed barn. The proposed fencing for the east boundary of the gardens for Plots 7 and 8 of the renovated Old Dairy is

within 2m of listed buildings 51/53 The Village and because of the difference in existing ground floor levels this will block light into ground floor and even first floor windows! The separation between the gardens of Plots 5 and 6 is ill-considered in the use of fencing and where it is positioned. I suggest it needs to be revised.

The proposed conversion of the Old Dairy is inappropriate to make double storey and into 3 small units. Much better to keep as a single storey and reduce to a maximum of 2 units. There are no single storey houses in the whole development, and this could be very suitable for people with accessibility concerns. Single storey also creates less of an impact on the setting of adjacent listed building 51/53 The Village.

The proposed conversion of Manor Barn into 4 units looks horrible and surely the plethora of new wall and roof openings could create issues with the integrity of the existing building. I propose a conversion of 2 units and the retention of the lean-tos on the west side of the barn. This would halve the number of new openings and reduce the amount of parking and waste bin storage which would be visible from The Village, which is identified as one of the key views.

Layout, Design and Materials

The current proposals are more suited to a suburban location and completely inappropriate for the heritage centre of our village. This is the last farm in the village and it is in the most prominent of locations. I believe opportunities have been missed in the 2 recent farmstead redevelopments in Farnley Tyas, at Beech Farm and Park Farm. The style and size of the

proposed new houses is the same as in those 2 previous developments, but that doesn't mean Yew Tree Farm has to follow suit. If these proposals are approved, we will have lost any reflection of the villages' farming heritage.

Therefore, I recommend that the design should better reflect this farming past. So why can't most of the new build have the architectural style of the existing agricultural sheds i.e. low rise, timber walls and corrugated roofs. This would be more visually appealing for Plots 10-13 and provide a more sympathetic key view from the south when approaching from Storthes Hall. Plot 9 has an existing agricultural shed on that spot and the proposals for Plot 9 would be improved by building in this existing style. It would contrast better with the existing stone Old Dairy once renovated, rather than a new house of pale stone. Changing Plot 9 to a single storey and not moving it to the east, as proposed, will reduce the impact on the setting, visual and residential amenity of 51/53 The Village and New Lane Barn.

Any new build houses that are designed in stone must be constructed of reclaimed stone and roof slates. By doing so they will blend sympathically with the many existing stone buildings within and adjacent to the site, most of which are listed.

I recommend that you take a look from the south of the Park Farm redevelopment. The proposed view from the south for Yew Tree Farm would end up looking the same. Whilst they are not unattractive the design is not suitable for such a rural and prominent site such as Yew Tree Farm.

The design must be changed from being overtly suburban.

Another consideration for redesign is the need to reduce significantly, the large amount of glass in the elevations of Plots 10-13 when viewed from the south. This can be viewed for miles around and will cause significant light pollution.

The houses on Plots 10-13 need to be reduced in size and possibly to 3 plots, but any redesign must still include tree T4 which is proposed to be felled. Plot 10 is the largest house on the development and its proposed positioning is too close to the site boundary and will dominate the adjacent homes, 51 The Village and New Lane Barn.

Sloping site and the impact on neighbouring homes

The site slopes from the highest point at the south-west corner, with a difference of 5m to Farnley Road and 4.5m to The Village. The new build houses are large in scale and height and together with the proposed ground floor levels, this will result in them dominating the proposed conversions and adjacent neighbouring homes. The view from the south is one of the key views into the development and the new houses are far too large and there has been insufficient consideration as to an acceptable ground floor level to reduce the negative impact on this view and neighbouring homes.

I highlight that the proposed ground floor levels for Plots 9 and 10 are about 1 metre above the existing ground levels where they are positioned. Which is ridiculous! Neighbouring homes, 51 The Village, New Lane Barn and 1-4 New Lane Terrace have existing ground floor levels which are much lower. When they were built, they took into account the natural slope downwards to Farnley Road from the east side of the site boundary. The new houses will dominate and significantly reduce the visual and residential amenity of the existing properties. Therefore, there needs to be a radical re-think about the size, position and levels of Plots 9-13 to minimise the negative impact on the adjacent residential properties.

Conditions

Once, Kirklees feels they can approve a more acceptable scheme then I expect that conditions will be attached to include the following;

- a) define suitable working times and limit disturbance and the environmental impact to residents from noise, dust etc.
- b) listed buildings must be complete before any new houses can be occupied
- c) regular cleaning of the roads in the centre of the village
- d) the only site access will be from the proposed new entrance from The Village
- e) all parking for construction vehicles, workers and deliveries must be contained within the area of the site to be developed
- f) the unfinished access off Farnley Road, part of a previous planning approval, should be reinstated by rebuilding the stone wall at Farnley Road and returning to agricultural use land which the access road crosses.

Finally, because of the particular issues with this site, I think that any final decision should be made by the planning committee and that the councillors should visit before considering this or any future application.

Yours sincerely,