

9 Hollybank Avenue,  
Batley,  
WF17 0AQ.  
2<sup>nd</sup> August 2023.

Ref: Rear extension and front extensions plans submitted for 11 Hollybank Avenue, WF17 0AQ.

The plans which have been submitted cause us great concern, largely due to the topography of the site/the historical problems associated with it, and other elements outlined by the Coal Authority. The site in itself is quite sloping. When the houses on Hollybank Avenue were built, No 11 was added later as an 'extra' and hence does not have the same access at the other properties. One of the main problems associated with the building this house, on what had been earmarked as gardens, is that it is a particularly wet site, as it directly adjoins a large area of open farmland, but at a lower level, thus attracting considerable run off. A large part of the site is very regularly waterlogged, and since we have been in residence, the banking adjoining the fields has collapsed completely on 2 occasions, having to be rebuilt after the landslide. A major concern here is that the new plans will more than double the existing footprint of the house, hence making this already problematic site even worse, and diverting more excess water as run off/seepage onto our own property. I have read through the additional notes, and it is quite clear that the environmental impact of the plans is not been taken seriously at all/completely disregarded. The fact that water butts have been suggested is simply ridiculous. As I write this, we experienced almost 2 inches of rain in the last 24 hours, hence the water butts would have been long overflowing. What is needed should this development take place is a comprehensive improvement of on-site drainage, not some water butts.

A report from the Coal Authority for No 11 states; ***The proposed development lies within an area that has been defined by The Coal Authority as containing potential hazards arising from former coal mining activity. Any form of development over or within the influencing distance of a mine entry can be dangerous and raises significant safety and engineering risks and exposes all parties to potential financial liabilities. The Coal Authority considers that the building over or within the influencing distance of a mine entry should wherever possible be avoided. A small section of driveway and front of the garden is a high risk area.***

The section in front of the garage has recently been deeply excavated when the garage was recently converted into a bedroom with large forward facing window. Although I am no expert, I am led to believe that this should have warranted a **planning application** in itself. At no point was any prior consultation entered into. I am of the opinion that ***building regulations/control*** were not involved in this development.

It now appears that it is the intention of the applicant to apply for different sections stage by stage. As the garage has now already been converted into a bedroom, there is no garage. Is this to appear later?

As we have already stated, the proposed extension more than doubles the footprint of the property and will create a very problematic situation around water. I wonder how much more of the site is then to be taken up by driveways/hard standings. **Are we approaching any limits here?** As stated previously, the site does not have the same access levels as all of the other properties on Hollybank Avenue.

For what it is worth, I believe that the resulting development, due to its doubling in size would be out of character, in terms of scale/massing with the surrounding properties.

Looking at the somewhat irregular nature of the plans, it is our fear that the most likely intention is for the conversions to create a *house of multiple occupancy* through circumvention of legislation through submission of multiple applications. The notice for permitted development is still within the remit for C1, however if all applications had been submitted together, then full planning permission would have been required.

Is there any future proofing available here? What is to stop the flat roof becoming a balcony to take away our own residential amenity, or indeed a second floor been added?

Although you have already made clear today( 2<sup>nd</sup> August Edward Cheseldine) that as a department you are totally disinterested in our views, however, I submit them for your consideration anyway.

Certain guidelines have been adhered to, i.e. within a national framework.

However, I would hope that some integrity could be shown here as this is not a straightforward development due to the problematic nature of this site, and although it is not a surprise, it is simply wrong to be told that our views are irrelevant when the consultation period still has over a week to go.

I invite you to for once, put yourselves in our shoes.

Yours Faithfully,