

About the application

Application number: 2022/92406	
What is the application for?:	Erection of 10 affordable dwellings, with access from Chapelgate and associated
Address of the site or building:	Land Adj, 67, Chapelgate, Scholes, Holmfirth, HD9 1SX
Postcode:	HD9 3BW

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	Yes

Further objections - in addition to my previous comments

Passivhaus principles

The updated planning statement still appears misleading and to imply that these houses will be built to Passivhaus standards when they won't be. This is simply misdirection. This is only an 'aim' – to obtain Passivhaus' accreditation would mean these houses would not be 'affordable' to build (even with the land being given to the developer for a peppercorn rent') This is meaningless and should be disregarded – it's like saying you will build a Kia Picanto to Porsche standards – it means nothing. This is a serious misrepresentation on behalf of the developer.

Misleading results of the 'consultation'

The information supplied by the developer in relation to 'local' support for the development following in from their 'consultation' is misleading. It gives the false impression that more people are in favour of the development than is actually the case.

Their 'consultation' was misleading. For a long time, it was not made clear to locals that the proposals are for RENTAL properties. Many of the supporting comments already submitted make reference to this development helping people BUY affordable houses and get in 'the housing ladder'. These people have obviously been taken in by the developer's marketing and don't understand that this development will not be available for their children/family to buy and to get a 'leg up' on the housing ladder.

Additionally, as noted above, these homes will not necessarily be available for people of Scholes to rent, the tenants will come from the wider, Kirklees social housing register. It is apparent from information on the developer's own website that after the first round of rentals have expired, there will only be a requirement that 50% of the tenants have a local connection. So again, people may be supporting this development without understanding the full implications here. These supporting comments should be disregarded, as they are not based on the true facts of the matter.

Finally, the consultation carried out by the developer was also misleading and misrepresentative of the public's support for this proposal. The survey asked very leading/biased questions around whether people were in favour of social/environmentally housing in general and asking what houses/facilities people would want to see on the site. It did not ask about alternative uses for the site or advise people how they could voice their objections to the development. If you read the 'do you have any other comments?' (Q10) responses, you can see that MANY people responding to the survey in fact voiced concerns and objections to the proposed development. Surprisingly, these responses don't appear to have made their way into the summary figures the developer has included in order to show local support for the project.