

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
Dear Mr. Hirst, I have tried to review all of the documents attached to this application (which are extensive), but I am still left with a number of questions/concerns, that compel me to object to this application. If my understanding is correct, and put very simply, Kirklees' policy allows for development in the greenbelt only in exceptional circumstances (where there is a need for affordable social housing), and then only provided any such development is in keeping with the greenbelt. Whether one disagrees or agrees with need in the Holme Valley (both sides of the argument could probably conduct surveys to support their side of the argument), I am not convinced by the reassurances that these houses will be let to people who are living and working in the local area (the Holme Valley). It is clearly not the case that there is a need across the entirety of Kirklees, so please could you clarify how these houses will remain in perpetuity for rent by people living and working in the Holme Valley? One would have thought a restrictive covenant on the land would suffice, something akin to the type including when a property is only for use by agricultural/forestry workers. Is such a restrictive covenant/condition to be included? Likewise, if planning is to be granted, then the development must be in keeping with the greenbelt. I am not sure how large retaining walls are in keeping with the greenbelt, please can you clarify? I am also unclear as to why Yorkshire stone is not being used, as this is far more in keeping with the local villages, as is evidenced by the already existing social housing in Scholes and on Chapelgate Road itself (opposite the site)? In relation to the drainage topic, as someone who lives south of the proposed development on Dean Bridge Lane, I can tell you that the existing drain network is already insufficient to cope with the water running down the road, it overflows virtually all winter (this is well known to the local residents and I believe Kirklees), so I would like to see more concrete proposals as to how this development will manage this issue? The site and Dean Bridge Lane regularly flood (the lane from both directions)	

issue? The site and Dean Bridge Lane regularly flood (the lane from both directions), so where is the flood alleviation scheme/plan? There definitely needs to be more drains built to the north of the site on Chapelgate road, or the run off will simply flood the new houses and down Dean Bridge Lane (potentially flooding my home and the other houses down the lane). Making pavements around the entrance to the site could actually worsen the drainage problem, as this might divert water towards the middle of the road rather than down the channel down the west side of Dean Bridge Lane and into the existing drains. I know this, as I am the one who has to go up the road and unblock the existing drains (which are already too few in number) almost daily in heavy rain.

In relation to the existing footpath, please can you clarify why the presence of a footpath is not an issue in this particular case? I understood the process of attempting to simply move or redirect a footpath to be extremely arduous, however, in this instance building over the footpath and completely blocking it off is not even registering as an issue (this seems strange to me).

I would also like to understand further why greenbelt land is being used in preference to the abundance of brownfield land that is available, even in the Holme Valley? I do not subscribe to the view that building on greenbelt land should be acceptable because it is cheaper and less problematic to build on than brownfield land, as this will always be the case (making this proposed development an extremely alarming precedent if approval is granted)! If this development is approved, given the bad (one might say dangerous) access, flooding, limited public transport, destruction of biodiversity and loss of public space etc etc, then I am not sure on what grounds Kirklees could ever object to any social housing being built on any greenbelt land in the future (I would imagine lots of developers will be eagerly watching to see if they can resubmit their previously rejected greenbelt applications).

In relation to access, this is clearly a dangerous access point and the traffic survey was conducted at an inappropriate time (school holidays), but once again this seems to be of little relevance, which is surprising (especially given the previous rejections on the same road). If anything, I would say pavements might make the matter worse not better (as the road will be even narrower). Please could you clarify why Kirklees do not consider this as a risk factor, and why the change of position?

It would also appear the the relevant checks and balances seem to be lacking in relation to this application, with the local parish council abstaining due to some form of ownership/interest of/in the land (somewhat disenfranchising the local voice), and a member of the planning committee having to also abstain due to some form of alleged conflict of interest. Please can you clarify how the appropriate checks and balances have been maintained in relation to this application? In the absence of the normal checks and balances, one might imagine that this application, if approved, could potentially be subject to judicial review.

Many thanks for taking the time to read my comments and consider the points that I have raised. If you would like to discuss my comments, especially around the drainage/flooding issues (as someone with first hand experience of the issue), I can make myself available at your convenience.

With kind regards