

From:
To: [DCAdmin](#)
Subject: Planning Application 2023/91212 Location: Land off, Bankfield Drive, Holmbridge, Holmfirth, HD9 2PH - Objection
Date: 14 June 2023 17:52:31

I wish to object to the above planning application 2023/91212 on the following grounds:

Highways

The two access roads to the new development are dangerous, Bankfield Drive being a 1:5 and Laithe Bank Avenue being a 1:6 and no level standing at either junction. Although this was acceptable when the original estate was built in the 1970's, it is no longer regarded as being safe. Within the Kirklees 2019 Design Criteria, a gradient of 1:25 is recommended with a level standing of 10 metres therefore this application contravenes Kirklees own guidelines. The Transport Statement makes no mention of the actual gradients of Bankfield Drive and Laithe Bank Drive.

The sight lines at the junction are very poor and it is not possible to see down Smithy Lane when exiting Bankfield Drive. The roads are never gritted and there have been several instances where a vehicle has failed to stop and crashed into the wall across. There is a steep drop of 12 metres on the other side of the wall which could cause a serious or fatal accident. There is already a history of accidents at this site requiring the wall to be repaired.

Smithy Lane, Dobb Top Road, Bank Lane are very narrow with no pavements. Dobb Top Road is a dedicated Rural School Route and is used twice daily during term time by children from Holmbridge pre-school on route to Hinchliffe Mill School as well as High School children walking to the bus stop in the village. Any additional traffic on these roads is putting children's lives at risk. It is also a popular cycle and walking route. There is evidence of subsidence on Dobb Top Road.

The pavements on Bankfield Drive, Laithe Bank Drive and Laithe Avenue are in a very poor state. They are crumbling away and full of moss and weeds which makes them very slippery. With such steep gradients, people tend to walk on the road to avoid falling but this is obviously dangerous. The developers claim that Kirklees are responsible for maintaining the pavements but there is no maintenance which is why they are in such bad repair.

The Holme Valley Parish Council have already expressed concerns regarding the amount of traffic on the main A6024 Woodhead Road and the number of parked cars creating obstacles for traffic and pedestrians. The new development, which has 45 allocated car parking spaces, will add to this problem and also create additional traffic on the narrow roads through Hinchliffe Mill, eg Old Road, Co-op Lane and Ford Gate especially as there has also been planning passed for another 19 residences at the old mill site in Hinchliffe Mill. The application has parking spaces for 45 cars but there are no plans to improve the highways to cope with

the additional traffic.

There is also the question of the stability of the supporting 2.8m dry stone wall at the north of the development site which has not been assessed even though paragraph 8.7 of the Ground Investigation Report states that the structural integrity of this wall and its suitability for the long term support of the site and proposed adjacent properties/gardens should be assessed.

Over-intensification/Overlooking/Overshadowing

There are too many houses for the area of land leading to over-intensification of the site. On the original estate there are 14 houses to 0.85 hectares, whereas on the planning application there are 16 houses to 0.65 hectares. The houses are too close to the existing houses on Laithe Avenue and Bankfield Drive which will cause overlooking, overshadowing and loss of privacy.

In particular, Plot 1 is set at a distance of only 4.5 metres from our property, 2 Laithe Avenue. The SPD guidelines (7.19) state a minimum separation distance of 12 metres between windows of habitable rooms that face onto windows of a non-habitable room. I note that the developers have afforded the properties on Bankfield Drive a separation distance of at least 12 metres therefore why aren't the same rules applied to our property on Laithe Avenue? For information, our house was built facing west towards Holme Moss to make the most of the vista and views (being the end house), therefore we do not have a door on the road frontage, our principal entrance door and windows from our living room and dining kitchen are at the side of the house facing the new development. As the plans now stand, the wall of plot 1 would be 4.5 metres away from the principal facade of our house which will cause an immense loss of light and privacy and is totally unacceptable. It is not clear whether the plans pass the 45 degree rule where no development should intrude over a line drawn at an angle of 45° in the horizontal plane from the midpoint of the nearest window of a habitable room. Greater separation distances are required to prevent loss of light and overshadowing to habitable rooms.

Point 7.19 also states that a new dwelling located in a regular street pattern that is two storeys or above, should normally have a minimum distance of 2 metres from the side wall of a new dwelling to a shared boundary, however there is not a regular street pattern in this case. All the houses on Laithe Avenue are of a different design and are a mix of detached houses and bungalows therefore these guidelines cannot be applied in this situation.

I would draw your attention to the Kirklees Local Plan (LP24 11.10) which states that the distance between buildings should reflect local development densities, take into account topography and still ensure that the design of development does not allow for overlooking. LP24 11.10 also states that the form of development can influence the activity of users in places and can help maintain high standards of amenity, for example by providing space between buildings to prevent overlooking and loss of privacy. The plans submitted do not comply with these points and in order to achieve this, the number of properties proposed should be reduced, especially on the southern boundary where the plans show four plots which is too many for the available space and does not meet the requirements of Kirklees Housebuilders Design Guide.

LP24 11.11 mentions that consideration should be given to views, vistas and skylines. The layout of development should take into account the street pattern in the locality and the size of blocks and plots. This is not the case as plot sizes in these plans are smaller than the house plots on the original estate and the current street pattern is not followed.

Design/Style of Houses

The houses planned are not in keeping with the local area. It is proposed that they are built in artificial stone whereas all the surrounding houses are built with real stone. The plans include link detached houses but there are no link detached properties on Laithe Avenue, Bankfield Drive, or Laithe Bank Drive. Kirklees Local Plan, Policy 24 11.7 states that good design can be incorporated into a development scheme without adding significantly to the cost.

In addition, the properties are not energy efficient. The Holme Valley Neighbourhood Plan Policy 12: Promoting Sustainability p152 states "All new buildings should incorporate technologies which generate or source energy from renewable, low carbon sources."

Kirklees Local Plan LP24 states that proposals should promote good designs ensuring that the needs of a range of different users are met, including disabled people, older people (point f) yet there is no provision in these plans for any single storey properties, despite their being several bungalows on the original estate.

Drainage

The site has poor drainage and contains a spring. The sewage pipes will be unable to cope with the additional burden of 16 houses, they are already under strain and the sewage pipes down Smithy Lane have had to be relined which could reduce their capacity.

Loss of Green Space /Wildlife

The development is only 600 yards from the National Park and directly next to green belt land. It is the home to a plethora of wildlife including hedgehogs, bats, hares, deer, barn owls, house martins (protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981) and many other bird species. The ecology report was undertaken during winter therefore it was outside the ideal dates for surveying summer migrant birds.

According to The People's Trust for Endangered Species, hedgehogs are deemed to be vulnerable to extinction and the organisation Save our Wild Isles (WWF, RSPB and National Trust) state that over the last half century, 30 million birds have vanished from our skies and 97% of wildflower meadows have been lost since the 1930's. We need to preserve the nature and wildlife in the Holme Valley, not deplete it.

Kirklees Local Plan (LP24 11.4) states that the topography across much of the district, particularly towards the Pennines in the west of the district, means that views and vistas should be given particular consideration, especially towards the Peak District National Park. Walkers on the public footpath (Holmfirth 91) regularly stop to take advantage of the magnificent views towards the Peak District which will be lost for ever if planning permission is granted.

Missing Data

The application does not show a cross-sectional plan of the development therefore it is impossible to see how the properties and gardens will lie in relation to the existing houses on Laithe Avenue and Bankfield Drive. For a development of this size, it is surely essential that a cross-sectional plan showing the topography of the land is included. The Ground Investigation Report states that the site has a gradient of 1:6 to 1:10 yet there is no information on the elevations of the houses or the slopes of the drives, gardens or roads.

The plans have a lack of detail in other areas too, for example, the house design for The Falmouth on plot number one is not provided. It is difficult to make constructive comments on missing and inaccurate data.

PROW

I understand that the owners of the southern boundary wall of the site will not give permission for access over their wall to the existing public footpath (Holmfirth 91). If this is the case, the plans need to be resubmitted without a footpath.

I would like these plans to be withdrawn or rejected on the grounds that, according to Kirklees policies, plot number 1 is too close to the neighbouring property, 2 Laithe Avenue. I also object on highway safety and loss of wildlife habitat.

2 Laithe Avenue