

DCAdmin

From:
Sent: 27 November 2023 13:57
To: DCAdmin
Subject: Objection to Planning Application No. 2023/92966

Categories:

“Bawson Cliffe”, 241 Cliffe Lane, Gomersal,
Cleckheaton, W. Yorks., BD19 4SB.

Date: 26/11/2023

Re: Planning Application No. 2023/92966
Demolition of existing dwelling (271 Cliffe Lane, Gomersal), BD19 4SB
and erection of 87 dwellings.

We refer to the planning letter sent to us by Kirklees Council dated 23 October, 2023 regarding the above proposed development. It states that any comments should be received by 27 November in the letter and this email complies with this request.

We write to express our strong objection to the above planning application proposal for the demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 87 dwellings with new access from Cliffe Lane.

We have fears that this development will impact adversely on both our own and neighbouring properties as well as the community at large for the following reasons:

- Water drainage - We have concerns over surface water drainage and how this could impact in the form of flooding to our own and other existing surrounding properties if this development goes ahead. Drainage of the site area is very poor and we are situated directly below the proposed site at the levelling-out point of the hill/fields in direct line of any such flooding. In the recent past we have experienced occasional flooding in our cellar due to burst piping issues further uphill and would wish to make sure that any such development on the site does not add to the issue.
- Mine shafts – We are greatly concerned by the fact that the site falls within a high risk area due to existing mine shafts and probable shallow coal mine workings, posing a significant risk to both surface stability and public safety with mine gas emissions. The Coal Authority’s Policy for Building over mine shafts’ (dated July 2011) states that “Building over or within the influencing distance of a mine entry raises significant safety and engineering risks and exposes all parties to financial liabilities and as a general precautionary principle should, wherever possible, be avoided”. On account of the obvious huge risks involved, surely this is not a suitable piece of land on which to build a substantial housing development? As our property and land lies on the western border of the proposed site we are worried about any possible subsidence to be caused by the development interfering with the current stability as well as all the mentioned safety risks involved. We ask that the Council and Coal Authority FIRST be in a position to assess the safety and risk factors involved before making a decision upon this Application. If subsequently granted, we would ask that some form of reliable, lengthy indemnity be provided against subsidence from any works to take place .

- Traffic – Vehicle movements of 2,181 as per the report were taken only between 0700-0915 and 1500-1845 on one single day - Tuesday 28 March, 2023. This is surely not sufficient nor truly indicative of the bigger traffic picture – at least a typical full week with the full daytime hours inbetween would be more true as there are many other vehicles such as Articulated HGV, small goods vehicles and delivery vans circulating in the area throughout those hours. As the neighbour adjacent to the entrance of this proposed new housing estate, I am also concerned by the prospect of vastly increased noise and air pollution created and compounded by both travelling and queuing cars waiting to get in and out of this one exit point on to Cliffe Lane. Up until now this has been a quiet public footpath with only 2 or 3 existing neighbours using it for vehicle access. The difference will be extreme!
- Traffic Calming Measures – Cliffe Lane is already very busy and traffic calming measures have already had to be put in place in an attempt to slow down traffic created by the Burnley's estate. The increase in traffic created by that development and others nearby was greatly underestimated at the time of planning and this mistake should not be made again. The proposed housing site would only add significantly to the existing problem with additional commuter traffic as well as traffic transporting children further afield for schooling.
- Community Infrastructure – We have deep concerns that the addition of these (initial) 87 dwellings will have a detrimental effect on the community infrastructure which is already under great strain. The existing lack of primary and secondary schools in the area has already resulted in a high number of children being turned away from their catchment areas. Doctors and dental surgeries in the surrounding area (there are none in Gomersal) are currently highly over-subscribed and it is already extremely difficult to secure appointments. It would be impossible for either of those to support increased numbers without significant investment and expansion being made to the local infrastructure prior to approval.
- Public Footpath – It is unclear to us what is to happen to the existing public footpath – whether the full current width of the existing path is to be maintained or not and clarification on this point would be appreciated. We would request that it is indeed maintained at the current width as the boundary wall and trees of 271 Cliffe Lane (the property to be demolished) would then act as some sort of buffer from the entrance to the housing estate with all the noise and air pollution to be created at that one single entrance (as mentioned above). This would provide some small form of seclusion from that and also retain the semi-rural appearance of the footpath itself which is currently attractive to walkers. The development layout point below also refers. It is also important to note that the wall immediately adjacent to the footpath is privately owned by our property and should not be taken as the boundary wall of the actual housing site.
- Development Layout – We agree with the Council that, in addition to the northern boundary, the development should also provide a soft transition on the Western boundary (next to which our over-200-year-old Georgian property is located). We also request therefore that the existing housing/garden layout of the development there should be reconsidered and a strong Green Belt boundary be retained before Application approval is granted.
- Built Heritage Assessment - We would actually disagree with the description of our property 'Bawson Cliffe' which lies adjacent to this proposed development on the western boundary. In The Executive Summary of the Built Heritage Assessment of this Application compiled by Prospect Archaeology Ltd it is described as a Victorian Villa when the property is actually a substantially older Georgian period house built from stone with a Georgian Entrance Portico and ionic columns as well as a coach house. An original Victorian conservatory extension was later added to the already existing dwellinghouse. (The Bawson Cliffe estate on which the property was built dates back at least as far as the late 1500s and is mentioned in the book 'Gomersal – A Window on the Past'). We would also disagree that its setting will not be impacted by the proposed site immediately adjacent with 3-storey houses not in keeping character-wise with the surrounding locality. We would ask that this is taken into consideration sensitively when reconsidering the development layout (see further above) and the preservation of the property's privacy. We would be happy for discussion with the developer to achieve this end.
- Bin Collection – Should this Application be successful, we would ask that provision be made so that the entrance area to our property does not become a temporary bin collection point for houses

occupied before the whole site is complete. We understand that the Refuse Collection Vehicle would not enter on to the building site area until full completion of the development.

- Parking & Construction Work Vehicles – Should the Application for this development be successful we would ask that facilities are provided off Cliffe Lane for associated construction work vehicles and staff parking to avoid congestion and obstruction. From the Carter Jonas report it would seem that completion of the development would take around 3 years so arrangements need to be put in place to make this the least troublesome to the local community as possible. This should also include protection of our property's boundary wall and the trees in our grounds, many of which are under preservation orders adjacent to the current public footpath. This was not the case with recent construction work which required large vehicle and digger access down the public footpath lane. Vehicles tried to pass each other with speed instead of stopping to give way to each other and this resulted in one of our most beautiful old trees being ripped from the ground and destroyed. We do not wish to have a reoccurrence of this.
- With this opportunity, we would suggest that amendment be made to Carter Jonas' Financial Viability Assessment. paragraph 11 Situation where it is claimed that a Tesco Superstore exists in Gomersal. This is not the case – there is no Tesco of any kind in Gomersal. Neither is there a Superstore of any other brand name in Gomersal as this is a village location and is one of the main reasons for opposition to such a large housing development in the area. The nearest Tesco superstore is actually located in Cleckheaton town centre. A small Tesco Express exists in the village centre of Birstall.

We would ask that our above objections and comments be taken into consideration before approval of this Application is granted.

Yours sincerely