

Address: 25 Woodhead Road Holmfirth HD9 2JU

About the application

Application number: 2023/91491	
What is the application for?:	Erection of 61 age-restricted apartments with ancillary accommodation including
Address of the site or building:	Prickleden Mills, Woodhead Road, Holmfirth, HD9 2JU
Postcode:	

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	No
<p>We are writing to object to restate our objection to the planning application lodged at Prickleden Mills ref:2023/91491 , for which you have received resubmitted drawings and invited reconsultation.</p> <p>These make superficial and cosmetic changes and adaptations to the current live application, and I cannot find any points which address the substantive objections we set out in our letter of objection dated 11/07/23, nor the very significant objections that you have received from the statutory consultees, notably the Environment Agency, Yorkshire Water and Conservation. I trust you will ensure that those objections are addressed in your Officer's report. I will not restate them all again. I have sought to comment further on points highlighted by the architect Acumen's covering letter (5/10/23) accompanying the substitute drawings.</p> <p>1. Kirklees Councillors and officers rightly refused application number 2021/62/92003/W from the same applicant and their design team. The five reasons for refusal of that application have not been addressed by this resubmission, and all remain applicable, and should be cited as reasons for refusing this application.</p> <p>2. The immense scale and massing will cause significant harm to the Conservation Area in Contravention of the National Planning Policy Framework paras 189-200. This scheme is some 77% bigger(see attached accommodation schedule comparison) in terms of its volume/scale and massing than the previously consented scheme(2012/90738).</p> <p>3. In the resubmission, the applicant's agent Acumen have once again claimed that the massing of the scheme is the same as that of the approved scheme. This is once again false.</p> <p>4. Its scale is larger than those homes in Lower Mill Road and anything else in proximity to the centre of Holmfirth. Acumen seek to obfuscate this key point, by discussing marginal changes in ridge height, the majority of which are yet again higher.</p> <p>5. Acumen's claim that the English Heritage and KC Conservation & Design comments</p>	

5. Acumen's claim that the English Heritage and KC Conservation & Design comments on the approved scheme in 2012/13 give authority and justification for increasing the scale of the proposed new scheme in 2023 are absurd.

6. Acumen's statement that 'the proposed development is clearly not a dominant feature when seen from Woodhead Road' is also ridiculous. It suggests they have not seen or reviewed Viewpoints 7 and 10 from the Heritage and Visual Impact Statement submitted with their application. They clearly show how the view up the Holme Valley from Woodhead Road for tourist visitors will be obliterated.

7. The scale and massing bears no relation to the historic Prickleden Mill which was originally a 2 and 3 storey structure as is evidenced on the photograph from 1903 (previously supplied). It also occupied far less of the site than the proposals which are being put forward.

8. The design of the scheme is in breach of policy LP24 'Design'.

(a) It does not enhance the character of the townscape, heritage assets or landscape.

(b) It does not promote high levels of sustainability

(c) It does not promote the needs of a range of different users.

(d) It does not demonstrate how it contributes towards enhancement of the natural environment, support biodiversity, and connect to and enhances ecological networks and green infrastructure. The developer should formulate plans during construction and post completion for opportunities for the preservation and enhancement of this wildlife.

9. The Developer has not provided a Daylight and Sunlight Assessment in accordance with the BRE methodology showing the impact of the proposals on existing dwellings, and in particular 23, 25, 27 and 29 Woodhead Road which are those most affected. They reject the idea in direct correspondence that they are causing any detriment. Please can you require them to formally do so by carrying out and submitting an assessment to include consideration of issues in respect of Rights of Light.

10. The scheme provides very little public benefit and seeks to represent as public and community contributions design features that are wholly for the benefit of the new scheme and its saleability. There is even less public benefit arising from the scheme than on the refused application.

11. It creates a very insular and inward looking gated development. The development seeks to turn its back on and exclude the existing community, by being lock-gated at all access points. Whereas the river walkway route on the consented scheme went through the development, this seeks to route it entirely outside, and there are gates preventing any public pedestrian access across the site. The work to the Mill Dam (restyled as 'Prickleden Lake' in their advertising webpage <https://www.elistonhomes.co.uk/>) is to create an amenity facility for the exclusive use of the 'luxury development'.