

Subject: Objection to 2022/62/92406/W

3

Despite concerns raised by local residents over current road safety issues, which will be further exacerbated by this development and the increase in traffic on what is already a very dangerous blind bend, I can see no mention in the amended proposal that alleviates these concerns.

It also seems that our concerns over when the traffic survey was carried out (during school half term holidays, outside of peak times) have been ignored. This survey does not give a true representation of the traffic volume and speed on Chapelgate and the Dean Bridge Lane/White Wells Road junction which is directly opposite the proposed development site.

To further highlight the highways issue and support my objection, I would like to reference the below planning application submitted in 2005 for a small 5 property development on White Wells Road, and the attached 'refusal notices'.

<https://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2005/91267>

The application was refused 'due to the proposed development being considered detrimental to highway safety and contrary to Policies D2, BE1 and T10 of the Kirklees Unitary Development Plan' the specific reasons for which are outlined in the attached document.

I understand the Local Plan has superseded the Kirklees Unitary Development Plan but the above policies were saved and included in the Local Plan. These are the two policies in the Local Plan that cover the previously named D2, BE1, BE2 (LP24) and T10 (LP21) referred to above.

Following the refusal the applicant amended the proposal and reduced the number of properties to 3 and the application was subsequently passed and the properties have been built.

That was back in 2010 and many more properties have been built in Scholes since then, which has increased the traffic throughout the village and on the roads around the Chippings site. During peak times, in particular during the school run, the roads Chapelgate/White Wells Rd/Dean Bridge Lane are very busy with parents dropping off and/or collecting their children from the pre school on White Wells Rd and the junior school on Marsh Rd.

I implore that the planning officer(s) and planning committee review again the traffic survey submitted by EcoHolmes and the previous aforementioned application refusal, and the reasons for refusal, before passing this application.

10 properties will potentially mean 10-20 more cars, entering and exiting a site situated on a dangerous blind bend. The sight lines submitted in the application are questionable, the traffic survey results are very questionable and for those of us who live close to the site and are faced with cars speeding round the blind bend on a daily basis the idea of the dangers being further increased are unthinkable!

Please stop this proposal!!"



Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995

REFUSAL OF PERMISSION FOR DEVELOPMENT

Application Number: 2005/62/91267/W3

To: ACUMEN DESIGNERS & ARCHITECTS LTD

For: JAMES WIMPENNY LTD

In pursuance of its powers under the above-mentioned Act and Order the Kirklees Council (hereinafter called "The Council") as Local Planning Authority hereby refuses to permit:-

ERECTION OF 5 DWELLINGS WITH INTEGRAL GARAGES AND DETACHED GARAGE BLOCK

At: 11 white Wells Road, scholes, holmfirth

In accordance with the plan(s) and applications submitted to the Council on 24 Mar 2005. The reasons for the Council's decision to refuse permission for the development are:

(1) The proposed development is considered detrimental to highway safety and contrary to the objectives of Policies D2, BE1 and T10 of the Kirklees Unitary Development Plan, in particular to:

- (a) the lack of adequate visibility from plots 1 and 2 and the new access road
- (b) parking arrangements for plot 3
- (c) the junction stagger between the proposed access with White Wells Gardens; and
- (d) the width of the access road

as such the proposal would lead to potential vehicular conflicts and parking on White Wells Road, detrimental to both pedestrian and highway safety.

(2) The proposed development due to its design, bulk, mass and building height would appear over dominant, intrusive and out of character in the street scene failing to respect the character and appearance of surrounding development in particular the adjacent building to No. 11 White Wells Road contrary to the objectives of Policies D2, BE1 and BE2 of the Kirklees Unitary Development Plan.

Dated: 19 May 2005

Signed:



Keith Faragher
Head of Planning Services

Address to which all communications should be sent:

Planning Services, PO Box B93, Civic Centre, Off Market Street, Huddersfield, HD1 2JR



Kirklees
METROPOLITAN COUNCIL

DECISION

19 MAY 2005

ISSUED

Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995

REFUSAL OF PERMISSION FOR DEVELOPMENT

Application Number: 2005/62/91267/W3

To: ACUMEN DESIGNERS & ARCHITECTS LTD
JEREMY CHILD
HEADROW HOUSE
OLD LEEDS ROAD
HUDDERSFIELD
HD1 1SG

For: JAMES WIMPENNY LTD

In pursuance of its powers under the above-mentioned Act and Order the KIRKLEES METROPOLITAN COUNCIL (hereinafter called "The Council") as Local Planning Authority hereby refuses to permit:-

ERECTION OF 5 DWELLINGS WITH INTEGRAL GARAGES AND DETACHED GARAGE BLOCK

At: 11, WHITE WELLS ROAD, SCHOLES, HOLMFIRTH

In accordance with the plan(s) and applications submitted to the Council on 24 March 2005. The reasons for the Council's decision to refuse permission for the development are:

- (1) The proposed development is considered detrimental to highway safety and contrary to the objectives of Policies D2, BE1 and T10 of the Kirklees Unitary Development Plan, in particular to:
 - (a) the lack of adequate visibility from plots 1 and 2 and the new access road
 - (b) parking arrangements for plot 3
 - (c) the junction stagger between the proposed access with White Wells Gardens; and
 - (d) the width of the access road

as such the proposal would lead to potential vehicular conflicts and parking on White Wells Road, detrimental to both pedestrian and highway safety.

- (2) The proposed development due to its design, bulk, mass and building height would appear over dominant, intrusive and out of character in the street scene failing to respect the character and appearance of surrounding development in particular the adjacent building at No. 11 White Wells Road contrary to the objectives of Policies D2, BE1 and BE2 of the Kirklees Unitary Development Plan.

Dated: 19 May 2005

Signed: *Keith Fawceter*
Head of Planning Services *sf*

Address to which all communications should be sent:

Planning Services, PO Box B93, Civic Centre, Off Market Street, Huddersfield, HD1 2JR

IMPORTANT - YOUR ATTENTION IS DRAWN TO THE NOTES ATTACHED