

---

**Sent:** 25 November 2024 22:11

**To:** Ellie Thornhill <Ellie.Thornhill@kirklees.gov.uk>

**Subject:** Planning application 2023/91212: Land off Bankfield Drive, Holmbridge

Good morning Ellie,

Further to our conversation I am writing on behalf of current residents of the estate.

As you are aware, existing residents wholly object to planning being approved on the site for reasons which will be made clear at the Strategic Planning Meeting. In addition, there are other areas of the planning application which have not been adequately addressed despite being questioned on a number of occasions:

1. The proposed planting of the native hedges and shrubs to ensure privacy for existing homeowners is wholly inadequate. Orion are proposing the hedge and shrubs to be to be 60cm – 100cm high. This is less than the height of the existing dry stone wall which currently borders the site. In fact, as you may recall from your site visit, when it gets to our house (4 Bankfield Drive) the wall slopes down to a height which is the same level as our patio! The right to privacy should be a prerequisite for existing homeowners. The proposal is simply not fit for purpose. Should planning permission be approved then surely a mature hedge of a greater height is a necessity (eg mature laurel). I brought this up with you in writing on my email dated 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2023 and to date have not had an answer other than a verbal 'I will bring it up with the developer'.
2. The type of and number of trees proposed for shielding are again inadequate (please note the proposed girth). Trees such as wild cherry, although pretty, do not provide adequate shielding. Why are there so many gaps in the trees as well?
3. The dry stone wall bordering existing properties is in need of repair in a number of areas. As there has been no maintenance of the wall by the current owner in recent times, are we right to assume that this will be rectified should planning permission be approved? Who will maintain the wall in the future? You said you were querying this when you answered my email of 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2023.

4. With reference to the high dry stone wall bordering the northern end of the site, you said in reply to my email regarding our worries over it's stability and ongoing maintenance by stating 'We are awaiting further details with regards to the retaining wall'. To date we have heard nothing regarding this. Farhad Khatibi has confirmed that Kirklees Council are responsible for the general maintenance of this wall but what happens if it collapses? The collapse of that wall would be catastrophic for neighbouring properties and we do not want a 'Burnlee' case with a long protracted legal battle due to responsibilities not being properly defined at day one.
5. Who is responsible for ensuring that the management company will fulfil their obligations for 5 years and who will be responsible for maintenance issues after that period of time?
6. I refer to my email dated 29<sup>th</sup> November 2023. A number of our statements and questions with reference to incorrect information and figures contained within the Optima highways reports, along with our worries regarding pedestrian safety have not been adequately addressed by the most recent response from Kirklees Highways. Pedestrian safety has been largely ignored even though it is by far the most common reason that existing residents are objecting to the planning application. We live here. We see the incidents at the dangerous junction first hand. A safety kerb to help protect the wall from cars hitting it simply means that pedestrians (especially children) will have to walk further out into the already narrow road than they do now. It is common sense.

Should you require a copy of any emails I have sent you in the past please let me know.

Kind regards,