

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 the planning application lodged at Prickleden Mills ref:2023/91491</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 submission, and all remain applicable, and should be cited as reasons for refusing this application. The lack of considered and meaningful changes to the design to address the reasons for the refusal, is well illustrated by extensive usage of the same drawings, which still bear the 2021 dates they bore when submitted in support of the refused application.</p> <p>2. Its 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) . The previous scheme comprised 13 x 1b and 33 x2b with a Net Internal Area (NIA)of 34,812 sq.ft (125 habitable rooms). This scheme is 59x 2b and 2x3b with a NIA Of 61,570 sq.ft (185 habitable rooms). Its scale is larger than those homes in Lower Mill Road and anything else in proximity to the centre of Holmfirth. The statement at 3.4, page 3 of the Planning Statement that ‘the bulk and massing of the proposed scheme is in line with the previously approved scheme’ is false.</p> <p>3. Its immense scale and massing will cause harm to the setting of the grade 2 Listed Buildings at 25 and 27 Woodhead Road in contravention of National Policy and also Kirklees policy LP35 which states that development proposals affecting a designated heritage asset should preserve or enhance the significance of the asset.</p> <p>4. 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 attached photograph from 1903. It also occupied far less of the site than the proposals which are being put forward.</p>	

5. The eaves height of the revised proposal in places is up to 170m AOD making it in places 3 storeys higher than the consented scheme. . Some of the buildings proposed will exceed the height of the Listed Buildings at 25-27 Woodhead Road which will be dwarfed and obscured by these revised proposals in further offence to policy LP35.

6. The existing ground level is proposed to be raised by up to 3m to accommodate underground car parking . Aside from exacerbating the problems of height, scale and massing of the proposals, this is in contradiction to policy LP20 for Sustainable Travel with its prioritisation of private vehicles in direct contravention of the policies set out in the hierarchy in the policy itself.

7. The proposal contravenes and is therefore in breach of policy LP21 , Highways and Access. The Transport plan(and the application in general) do not demonstrate how they will promote National and Regional policies to promote sustainable development. Specifically it fails to demonstrate how the proposals will provide opportunities to promote the use of walking, cycling and public transport.

8. The proposal has failed to have proper regard and is therefore in contravention of policy LP22 'Parking' by giving limited consideration to alternative means of transport, and introducing such measures as a 'Car Club'. The single over large cycle store , remote from most of the dwellings should be rethought so that smaller storage provision with easier access for individual blocks are provided to encourage cycle use. This could be in lieu of a number of the parking spaces.

9. 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.

10. The proposal may be in breach of policy LP28 Drainage. The developer should be required to demonstrate outline proposals on how SuDS will be implemented , and should not be permitted to raise the Ground levels and especially not by the enormous amounts shown in the plans.

11. 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. Please can you require them to do so.

12. Given their age it is highly likely that a number of existing adjacent buildings in Woodhead Road, have prescribed Rights of Light, which is a material planning consideration. Please can you require the developer to carry out the requisite surveys with suitably qualified surveyors to evidence the position.

13. The 1937 photograph of Prickleden Mill (attached) clearly shows the view of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Area from somewhere along Cemetery Road. These views of the Listed and historic buildings , in particular 23-29 Woodhead Road will be obliterated by the enormous scale and massing being proposed. The CGIs previously submitted conspicuously failed to show the proposal in the context of the Conservation Area, Listed and historic buildings. The developers should be directed to produce a scale model, some images and drawings(particularly elevations) showing their proposals in context and comparison with these buildings. These could have been used in the Visual Impact Assessment , but they have chosen not to do so.

14. The Developer's Heritage and Visual Impact Assessment presents a partis