

Address: Royal Oak Inn, 19 Town Gate Holmfirth HD9 3UX

About the application

Application number: 2022/92799	
What is the application for?:	Erection of extensions, conversion of existing attached barn to living accommoda
Address of the site or building:	17, Town Gate, Upperthong, Holmfirth, HD9 3UX
Postcode:	HD9 3UX

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	No
<p>I wish to object to the plans submitted for 17 Towngate Upperthong, due to the numerous contraventions of planning guidelines, as laid out in National Planning Policy, Kirklees Local Development Plan, the Holme Valley Neighbourhood Plan, and the fact it is in the centre of the Upperthong Conservation Area.</p> <p>There are many reasons as to why I object to the plans, and they are listed in no particular order.</p> <p>Firstly, the application claims the site is 1873m², as this includes approximately 1000m² of agricultural land, therefore this is not part of the domestic curtilage. Furthermore, the section of grass below the shared wall to the north is clearly detailed on the Kirklees conservation map as part of the field, whilst there is a fence separating this section, this does not alter the fact it is not part of the domestic curtilage. As such any of the proposed plans on this area, the garage and access path/turning point, would contravene planning.</p> <p>The proposed access to the rear of the property through the barn is wholly unsuitable and will severely increase the potential for a fatal accident on what is already a very busy route through the Holme Valley. I can state very, very clearly the unsuitability of this part of the application. I no longer use the paved parking area of my property as it is simply not possible to exit onto Towngate safely, even with far, far more visibility to the west. The sheer amount of near incidents I have encountered simply made it unusable for parking. If this were passed there is no doubt it will endanger the lives of any pedestrians, horses and riders, dog walkers, or road users. Of which there are many.</p> <p>In addition to the safety aspect, it is simply nigh on impossible to enter, or exit the Barn, in either forward, or reverse gear, this will still be the case. A fact readily stated in the application!?</p> <p>The application also alludes to the fact that this is the only potential access, and clearly ignores the existing access to the east of the property, which at its pinch point is wider than the entrance to the Barn. This would allow for the double garage, that a car can</p>	

than the entrance to the Barn. This would allow for the double garage, that a one car family so so need, to be located inside the domestic curtilage.

Also due to the requirement to remove half of the rear of the Barn, it would be, as stated in another objection, architectural vandalism.

Has there been an Environmental assessment done? Given the abundance of bats I see, there is a strong possibility of nesting bats.

I also feel the opening of the barn, along with the plans for the internal alterations would not in any way be in keeping with the vernacular of the street scene.

Having followed the comments on this application my above feelings are echoed many, many times. I would go so far as to suggest it needs listing, before being vandalised.

I also feel that the plans submitted for the rear elevation of the property to be utterly unsuitable. Putting aside any feeling on good taste, and architectural merit, which having studied the application, could be argued. The materials suggested are so far removed from the traditional materials and design that are required to be used in a conservation area. The proposed ground to eaves expanse of wood and glass is certainly not traditional, and certainly not in keeping with the locality. I would not wish to be living in properties to the south of No 17. Given the path of the sun, the solar glare it will create will be unbearable.

As with the front elevation, whilst it currently seems to be the fashion, the use of timber is not a traditional external building material. Also the proposed garage, forgive me, but I am not aware historically of any local farmers, or anyone for that matter, using sedum roofs for any buildings. I may be wrong.

That then brings me to the question of the proposed wall on the shared boundary between The Royal Oak and the applicant. Whilst it is often stated that no one has a right to a view, it could be countered that no one has a right to block a view.

Certainly not to block one which belongs to the whole community far and wide. This is stated quite clearly in the HVDP, in its specific requirement to protect open views of the Pennines & Peak District.

The views are admired by not only customers visiting when open, they are also constantly taken in by walkers from out of the area who I encounter on a daily basis. They literally stop in their tracks and walk to the end of the car park to admire the view. The views from the rear of the Royal Oak are quite simply stunning, it is a major asset to the people of the valley, as a whole. I can state categorically any attempt to obstruct the view would potentially lead to the financial viability of the pub being in question. Given the challenges businesses have recently experienced, and with potentially worse to come, if the Pub shuts, I fear it would remain closed permanently. There have been questions raised in comments as to the whereabouts of the 'heart of the Village,' I can assure anyone and everyone who doesn't know, it is the Village pub. These plans are a direct threat to its survival.

I hope that the planning application in its current form will be seen for what they are, wholly unsuitable for this property and rejected.