

DCAdmin

From:
Sent: 12 September 2023 11:31
To: Nina Sayers
Cc: DCAdmin
Subject: Re: 2023/92079 Objection

Morning

Since I sent my objection around 5.30pm on 30th August I see that several other documents have been added to support this planning application. These items have been added after the 1st Sept deadline which means that the general public are unable to comment on these reports.

The Consultation Responses have jumped from 3 to 9:-

There are 3 copies of the same document from The Coal Authority:

id 1005566 24/08/23
id 1005571 30/08/23
id 1005573 24/08/23

The report (4th paragraph down) says "the application site falls within the defined Development High Risk Area....."

5th paragraph "The Coal Authority records indicate that the site lies in an area of probable historic unrecorded shallow coal mining. If shallow workings are present then these may pose a potential risk to surface stability and public safety."

I also see that mine gas could be present presenting a further risk.

Worryingly, the coal authority say permission is needed before any investigations potentially disturb coal yet we have already had workers on site who said they had found coal.

id 1006618 08/09/23 K C Ecology Unit

I see that if planning is granted, a section 106 agreement would be needed and a commuted sum of £43,470 would be payable.

There are 2 copies of the same document dated 4th Sept 2023 from KC Lead Local flood Authority:-

id 1006626 08/09/23
id 1006630 08/09/23

The report acknowledges that there are now plans in place to remove the surface water via a gravity connection out into the sewer on Moor Lane. There is therefore no longer a need for a pumping station. This has only been possible because Kirklees own 41 Moor Lane and have granted permission for this! The Council are actively supporting/helping Binks and there seems to be a conflict of interests here. We are all wondering what the financial arrangement is.

If planning is granted there will be considerable disruption to the residents of Moor Lane and the tenant of 41.

Supporting Information - An extra document has appeared:-

id 1006334 05/09/23 - 21942 Area Character and Density Appraisal Rev A Redacted
I comment as follows:-

a The document has the old planning ref number

b Re the photo of Summerdale - this is the denser part of Summerdale and not the area bordering the proposed development.

c The coloured density map previously appeared in Halstead's planning support statement, id 998738. Although I did not go into detail in my planning objection, I pointed out that the density figures on this map do not match those written in the paragraph above:-

Description of densities:-

Peel House 32 per ha - map shows 37

Moor Lane 27 per ha - map shows 32

Ventnor Close 25 per ha - map shows 42

Summerdale 21 per ha - map shows 22

Attaching a screen shot of page 8 to show this.

Sorry to say the whole planning application with it's supporting evidence and reports has several inaccuracies, misinformation and conflicting evidence. These all need checking out and I think there is not enough time to do so before the Planning Committee meeting set for 21/9.

Please remove all the duplicate copies within Consultation Reports - as listed above.

Regards