

Planning Application: 2022/91477, Land off Lindley Moor Road

Dear Sirs,

I am in receipt of your letter dated 11 July 2022 concerning the proposed development of land on the boundary of Alderstone Rise, Lindley HD3. I wish to object to the proposals set out in planning application 2022/91477 on the following grounds:

1. The proposed planning application does not comply with the Kirklees Local Plan and the site allocation.

Kirklees Council have a clear Local Plan policy with land allocation set out in your document MXS3 dated 27th February 2019. The above planning application does not conform to the policy and indeed, this is highlighted in the in the Agents planning statement:

“The proposal includes a number of employment generating uses which are not in accordance with the land’s allocation.”

Coffee shops, takeaways and convenience stores can be found in the local area situated in Weatherhill Road, Halifax Road, Salendine Nook and Lindley. There is no need for additional retail in the local area. The proposal would take trade from our established local businesses and rather than create employment, it would reduce employment in local stores and cafes, at a time when these businesses are experiencing particularly difficult trading conditions.

Following the pre-application feedback, I note that the fast-food outlet has been removed, however a large public car park remains, open to the public 24/7 offering space for groups to meet and possible anti-social behaviour. Sadly, access to the M62 is advantageous to criminals as well as businesses.

2. Inappropriate scale of warehouses

The proposed 52,000ft² warehouses P measures 94.6m in length, is 44.0m wide and is 11.12m high. The building is equivalent of four residential storeys high. This is completely out of scale with adjacent two-storey houses and single storey bungalows. This building should have been sited next to Lindley Moor Road, not next to the existing small-scale houses.

3. Inappropriate location of warehouse ‘P’

The large commercial warehouse building ‘P’ is totally out of scale with the adjacent residential houses. This huge building is better suited to an industrial estate. It should not be built next to small residential properties.

4. Light Pollution

The planning application includes both street and car park lighting. Due to the close proximity of the proposed warehouses there will be significant light overspill and light pollution to the neighbouring residential houses and their gardens.

5. Noise pollution – 24 hour working

The noise pollution survey included with the planning application is a desktop study based on one specific business, Falconer Print and Packaging, Elland. It is proposed that Falconer Print and Packaging will occupy the warehouse P1. Falconer Print and Packaging operate 24 hours a day, 7 days per week. No significant measures have been taken to make sure that there is no noise nuisance caused by the business working through the night in this residential neighbourhood. There is therefore a high possibility of resultant disturbed sleep for residents on Alderstone Rise caused by noise pollution.

The desktop study concedes that that there will be additional noise pollution

A condition should be placed on all the proposed commercial premises prohibiting night-time operation.

6. Noise nuisance from HGV, forklift truck and daily deliveries

It is proposed that the vehicle turning circle, located only 25 metres from houses, will be used by an HGV, twice in a single hour, every day.

The Acoustic report states that *“The site is reasonably well separated from neighbouring houses”*. This is an inaccurate and misleading statement. There are a number of homes backing onto the site and they will be significantly affected by the building of a very large, four storey warehouse which operates 24 hours a day, 7 days per week. The acoustic study suggests that there is no perceived change in quality of life, but details of the landscaping design makes reference to the erection of a sound-proof fence, so there must be increased noise at the boundary.

7. Soundproofing Fence

It is proposed that a 2.0 meter (6 feet) high soundproof fence is to be erected behind the houses on Alderstone Rise to deal with the noise nuisance created by external operations. The inclusion of an acoustic fence in the design proposal raises concerns that;

- i. there will be noise generated both day and night (especially as the warehouse has 24 hour operation)
- ii. the creation of a ‘dead’ space between the existing back garden fences and the proposed acoustic fence. This space is not overlooked, has no natural surveillance and is therefore a perfect location for anti-social behaviour.

No detailed plans for the commercial units near the houses on **Haigh Way, Haigh Road and Weatherhill View** have been provided with this application. But, buried in the Acoustic Report,

there are details of a 4.0 meter (13 feet) high acoustic fence. This clearly raises concerns about the high noise levels that developers are predicting will be generated on this development.

8. Loss of visual amenity

On the northern boundary of my house there are open views across grass fields with grazing cattle. The construction of warehouse and associated acoustic fence will mean the loss of this visual amenity for all residents on the northern side of Alderstone Rise.

9. Employment opportunities

There is repeated mention in the application to the creation of 300 new job opportunities. If the warehouse is to be occupied by an established business, surely the existing staff will simply relocate to the new premises? What new job opportunities will realistically be generated?

10. Increased Traffic on Lindley Moor Road

As mentioned by many numerous other local residents in their consultation responses, Lindley Moor Road is already a heavily congested road. The addition of another opening between Weatherhill Road and Crosland Road and the creation of an additional 15 new business premises will just exacerbate the existing problem.

The number of parking spaces provided within the plan highlights the large number of vehicles expected to use the site daily. This will be exacerbated by the proposed 24 hr operation of Warehouse 'P', with at least three shift changes over the 24 hour period.

Falconer Print and Packaging has its existing business premises in Elland and therefore already enjoys easy access to the M62 via the more appropriate A629 Huddersfield Road, which is a dual carriageway. Maintaining their business in one of the many warehouses available in Elland will reduce the need for additional employee traffic trips, HGVs and delivery vans along the unsuitable Lindley Moor Road.

11. Delayed Consultation

The planning proposal was received by Kirklees Council on 3rd May 2022 and validated on 9th May 2022. However local residents were only informed of the application by letter dated 11th July 2022, leaving little time for the Case Officer to respond to consultation comments prior to the application going to Planning Committee.

12. Lack of Application Information

Many of the documents associated with this application, including the critical Design and Access Statement and building elevations, could not be viewed online, or downloaded from the Kirklees planning website. As a result, I telephoned Kirklees Council and asked to speak to the Case Officer, only to be told that:

- i) it was not possible to speak to the Case Officer directly

- ii) it takes 7 days to receive a call back (I called 10 days ago and have not received a reply)
- iii) it takes 10 days to receive an answer from the Case Officer by email.

This does not allow enough time for the Case Officer to receive consultation feedback and then respond to the local residents comments prior to the end of the consultation period.

13. Incomplete consultation process

Furthermore, Kirklees Council have asked local residents to offer comments on a proposal that they find difficult to gather basic information. As a result, my response is based on the limited number of documents that I was able to access. The planning consultation process has not met statutory requirement and should therefore be re-run to ensure that all residents have access to all the relevant materials, reports and drawings.

In summary, based on the thirteen substantial points noted above, I strongly object to the proposed planning application and request that it is refused based on; it's poorly conceived design, the inappropriate scale and siting of the buildings, the harmful impact it will have on local houses and the harmful impact it will have on our residential community.

Yours faithfully,