

Address: 63 Primrose Hill Batley Wf17 0QA

About the application

Application number: 2021/94280	
What is the application for?:	Erection of 65 dwellings with associated works
Address of the site or building:	land at, Lady Ann Road, Soothill, Batley, WF17 0PY
Postcode:	WF10 1LD

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	No
<p>I wish to object to the proposal to build 65 houses on land off Lady Ann road. This plot is our wildlife haven attracting bees, birds, water vole and bats and much much more. It offers space for walking and acts as the lungs to our overcrowded town. Building of these houses will dominate the local area and are not in keeping with type of buildings surrounding the plot and will look oddly out of place.</p> <p>The plot is a flood plain that regularly floods, I note in the plans that approx 15 houses are in the flood zone and that the houses will be raised so they should not flood, however this does not help the existing houses on Lady Ann road that are at risk of flooding as the run off to the beck will only increase the flow into the beck. Also raising the houses will make them more dominating in appearance.</p> <p>The plot is a wildlife haven and has protected species such as water voles and bats, any building work will have a detrimental affect on them. The loss of high value habitat and the dispersing of wildlife into the wider community is not acceptable and paying compensation to Kirklees does not help our community or wildlife in the slightest.</p> <p>The plan to fell existing trees and then replant trees down the boundary of the rear gardens of Primrose Hill is ridiculous and the plans show planting a tree 4mts from my rear door! Primrose Hill at the front spends the full day in shade because of the railway banking and the only sunlight we get is on a morning at the rear, this will be compromised due to the building of 3 story houses and the planting of trees right against our boundary.</p> <p>I would question if a right of way exists across the plot as I have always believed it to. The area does not have the infrastructure to cope with more residents, doctors and school places are at a premium and dentists appointments are non existent.</p> <p>I do not believe that this area can cope with any additional traffic, Soothill lane is gridlocked at peak times and can regularly take an hour to travel the length of it. Pulling out onto Soothill Lane from Lady Ann is very difficult due to Soothill lane being gridlocked and Lady Ann being a single track road due to parked cars., often the bus is not able to come down Lady Ann rd.</p> <p>The model for vehicle access onto the plot is flawed, the bridge appears to be single carriageway or at least it is when a large vehicle is on it. This would mean any vehicle wanting access to the development or even to pass it, would be a problem as they would have to wait for the vehicle to exit therefore stopping all traffic because of the parked cars on Lady Ann rd making it effectively a single track road, regularly cars</p>	

parked cars on Lady Ann rd making it effectively a single track road, regularly cars mount the pavement so they can pass each other, should the turning vehicle wish to head in the direction of the waiting car then this would result in having to reverse back to a suitable passing point and this could be 200 yards.

I would consider the proposed alteration to the junction of Lady Ann / Soothill lane as not being possible, moving the junction out into Soothill Lane would mean traffic heading up the hill and over the bridge would have to swerve into oncoming traffic.

I find the plans to be inconsistent, sometimes referring to and showing 71 houses and in other plans showing 65. I am aware that the plans are for 65 houses though, but the developers are trying to show a lower density of houses but I would argue that the density has increased in the usable land as the houses not in the plan were in the unusable land.

I find this application very frustrating as this is not a new application but has been amended with 38!!! Amended documents from a withdrawn application that was submitted in September 2021? Therefore no new advertising on lamp posts etc have been placed and also submitting it through the Christmas period when people are pre occupied all gives it an underhand appearance.

I would urge the planners to not only reject this application but also stop the yearly submission of plans that put us residents through stress and unnecessary worry that has been ongoing since 2016.

Kirklees has a chance to stand up for a local community and a wildlife haven and help the well-being of its existing residents.

Thank you for taking the time to read this