

Address: Cringles 61 Cliff Hollins Lane Bradford BD127ER

About the application

Application number: 2021/94060	
What is the application for?:	Variation condition 32 on previous permission 2016/92298 for outline application
Address of the site or building:	Former North Bierley Waste Water Treatment Works, Oakenshaw, BD12 7ET
Postcode:	

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	No
<p>This Planning Application is yet another affront to the people of Oakenshaw by the developers of this site. To give a bit of background to those trying to understand my reason for opposing this application... I apologise but the website will not allow me to copy links, so please cut and paste for some interesting reading!</p> <p>The Draft Local Plan, dated Nov 2016, rejected both applications for the current development area... E1985 and E1985b</p> <p>https://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-policy/pdf/local-plan-maps/rejected/Kirklees-North-Rejected-site-2016.pdf</p> <p>The Planning Inspector made his comment on both applications within the Draft Local Plan (see pages 24 and 25)...</p> <p>https://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-policy/pdf/rejected-site-options-2016.pdf</p> <p>I would like to highlight this particular comment...</p> <p>Exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify the release of land from the green belt. The northern extent of the proposed site abuts Cliffe Hollins Lane with Bradford. One of the purposes of the green belt is to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another and although it is acknowledged there is development on the west of Bradford Road, undeveloped frontages help to maintain the appearance of separation. The extent of this site would therefore significantly reinforce merger with Bradford contrary to the role and function of the green belt. Alternative employment option E1985a has been accepted instead as the potential for merger has been reduced.</p> <p>The only plan accepted (in line with the Planning Inspector's reports) was Application E1985a, which was adopted by the Local Plan in February 2019. Employment Area ES7, beginning at Page 11 refers to the development.</p>	

<https://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-policy/pdf/local-plan-allocations-and-designations.pdf>

Quite clearly this states an indicative area of 35,284 sqm available for development. And to back this up, here is the map showing the land allocated for development...

<https://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-policy/pdf/local-plan-maps/policy-maps/high-resolution/kirklees-north-high-res.pdf>

This allocation only includes the footprint of the old waterworks site, not the area of the green belt to the north!

Not only have the developers managed to acquire the area to the north, rejected by the Local Plan but they have taken the indicative area to mean floorspace for the buildings rather than the developed area. And now they want more! This will result in an additional building, the size of a football field, being placed within the development site, reducing the minimal greenspace within it. A greater impact for the environment!

The developers are trying to justify this Planning Application on a couple of fronts...

Firstly, they are claiming a change in the commercial market since the Outline Application was submitted in 2015. I say the developers were always going to submit this 'land grab' but were waiting for the Reserved Matters to be passed before doing so. If they cannot 'sell' the original Planning Application, they must work with their bad decisions and their failure to have a contingency plan. If the market has changed, the developers MUST be told to amend their B8 floorspace (if that is what they now want) to remain within the 35,284 sqm constraints. The community and Council are not responsible for bailing them out by allowing more floorspace to increase their profit margins.

And secondly, the developers are also telling us that another reason for change is (from the Planning Application)...

"Reason: In the interest of highway safety, to avoid an intensification in vehicle movement on the surrounding highway infrastructure and to accord with Policy LP21 of the Local Plan."

The developers are having yet another laugh at Oakenshaw's expense! They showed no concern whatsoever over the impact traffic was going to have on our community, despite 100+ objections over the access route! If they had any interest in highway safety, the site entrance should be amended to come off the M606... simples! Why isn't it? Money! Perhaps the lack of interest in the site is down to the ludicrous access route!

The report says there will be a reduction of approximately 6 vehicles going in and out of the site (from 155 to 149) at the peak hour... They are conveniently forgetting to mention that their figures are based upon 2011 traffic data! Here is the extract from the Outline Planning Application's Transport Assessment...

" I rip distribution has been determined using 2011 census data, which have also been extracted from the Office for National Statistics 2011 database"

They are referring to the same Tables and data for the amended traffic figures, so I would suggest that the actual movements will be considerably higher. The numbers do not correlate to the projected employment figure of 800+, otherwise rush hour will be rush 4 hours! As a reminder, employment was the sole reason to justify the Outline Application – what is the new figure I wonder, about 3-400 tops? And as for the chances of employing locally to avoid vehicular traffic... probably nil, unless the 'buyers' want a workforce of over-55s!

THIS PLANNING APPLICATION MUST BE REJECTED OUTRIGHT!!

Before I close, it must also be borne in mind that there are much-muted rumours that the developers are about to acquire even more land to the south of the site, previously reserved for a Highways England (now National Highways) plan to join the M62 to the M606 without circumnavigating Chain Bar. Any further applications beyond the current site parameters will further strain the local highways so Kirklees Planning should not even consider such an application.

Then again, if the developers are so concerned about avoiding an 'intensification in vehicle movement', they will not be submitting any further Planning Applications... as if they will care?