

About the application

Application number: 2023/92966	
What is the application for?:	Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 97 dwellings including formation
Address of the site or building:	Land to the rear of, 271, Cliffe Lane, Gomersal, Cleckheaton, BD19 4SB
Postcode:	

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	Yes
2023/62/92966/E	
<p>I wish to object to the inclusion of three storey apartment buildings on this site.</p> <p>I have noticed that in the proposals in the previous application there were to be several split level 2/3 houses but these would not be quite as intrusive as they are set on the incline of the land. This most recent application now includes two three storey apartment blocks, one of which is next to the public footpath between Ferrand Lane and Cliffe Lane. If this new plan is accepted, walkers who enjoy walking down Ferrand Lane and along the footpath to where it meets Cliffe Lane would, as they approached the corner of the site, be met by a large three storey block which, in my view would be very overbearing, and out of place next to the the semi rural nature of the footpath and the fields beyond.</p> <p>It can be argued that there are three storey apartments and three storey houses on the Burnleys site which, as the crow flies is not too far away, so it could be said, three storeys would not be out of place in this development. In my view, this is not a valid point. This location is quite different, as unlike the Burnleys site, which was a brown field site, these proposed buildings would be within a development on land which was green belt until changes were made by the Kirklees Local Plan, and the site is next to woodland and green belt fields.</p> <p>I would also like to make a comment with reference to the hedges on the site. I have mentioned in my previous neighbour representation (1046983) my concerns about inconsistencies in the many plans which have been produced for the application. I would like to make an additional point and I would like to draw your attention to the hedge on the eastern end of the site, namely hedge H1 as identified in the report from Elliott Consultancy arboricultural consultants.</p> <p>This report lists hedge H1 as being a hedge to be retained in the development and gives details as to how the hedgerow and its bird inhabitants should be protected during construction.</p>	

The hedge H1, at the eastern boundary of the proposed development can be seen on the plan on page 26 of the Elliott Consultancy report. It has a B2 classification - "of a condition that they make a substantial contribution to the site" The same identification number is used on the new "proposed landscaping layout" 1062242.

Unfortunately this hedge identification number is not the same in the Smeeden Foreman Ecological Impact Assessment. There is no mention of the importance of hedge H1 because, as close inspection of their plan on page 57 of the report will show, H1 is the identification labelling for the hedge beyond the red line boundary, between the adjacent field and private gardens. The hedge on the red line boundary is labelled H2 and receives a similar positive assessment to the same hedge labelled H1 in that of Elliott Consultancy, (thus allowing continuation of the habitat network). Could I suggest that it would be appropriate if the hedges in the site plan in the Smeeden Foreman report were to be re-numbered so that the red line boundary hedge becomes H1 as in the Elliott Consultancy Report and the Proposed Landscaping Layout, to avoid confusion. This may seem a small detail but when decisions are to be made, I think it is important the information across reports and plans is consistent.

I am concerned that there is varied clarity of detail regarding this hedge H1 and through misinterpretation at some point there could be a danger of the hedge being removed.