

08/08/2022

Re: Planning application number: 2022/91751

Dear Mathias Franklin,

We, the residents of 2, 4 and 6 Church Hill strongly object to the above planning application number **2022/91751** due to the following reasons mentioned below.

1. The applicant (a private landlord) is proposing to demolish out buildings belonging to Nos.2, 4 and 6 Church Hill which are clearly highlighted in the title plan of No.2 Church Hill. He has no right doing so as he is not the owner of this land. Therefore, he should not be given planning approval which allows him to encroach onto other people's land.
2. The proposed application to allow vehicles access in and out of the rear of my property, will contribute to noise pollution from vehicles and from tenants who will live in the HMO, disturbing the quality of life enjoyed previously.
3. Currently, the building is being used for commercial purposes and restricted hours of business. However, if the HMO application goes through then we will be faced with a 24 hour nuisance causing distress to the residents from noise, ultimately neglecting the rights of the residents to a quiet and peaceful enjoyment of their property.
4. His proposed plans will be a permanent hindrance and have an adverse effect on local amenities. There are already parking issues on Battye Street despite being a resident permit area. The proposed application will contribute to traffic congestion and possible risk to the health and safety for the residents and their children. There is a limited amount of space for vehicles to go in and out of the yard and vehicles attempting to manoeuvre in such a small area would certainly create a health hazard and endanger lives.
5. I have a right at the rear of the property hereby conveyed so as to afford access to and egress from the water closet (outbuildings). We have maintained the yard and have cleaned it for over 40 years. However, since the applicant has purchased 28 Battye Street there have been a number of issues such as fly tipping, overflowing bins and building materials left outside obstructing access to my property. This matter has been reported to the local

authority,

6. The residents have the utility of the out buildings, as i.e. extra storage and this will be lost.
7. The application doesn't serve the residents; it is for long term commercial gain for marketability.
8. Historically, the yard has never had facility for vehicle access and rightly so.
9. As the landlord resides opposite the building it smacks of a self-serving project for parking his own cars and the cars of his family. HMO's aren't usually occupied by car owners and it also restricts the residents free use of the out houses and restricts their boundary and privileges.
10. The rights of the residents of 2, 4 and 6 Church Hill will not be exercisable as originally intended if planning application is granted.

2 Church Hill
Dewsbury
WF13 1PJ