

Search application details

Application number: 2023/93087	
What is the application for?:	Erection of detached dwelling (within a Conservation Area)
Address of the site or building:	Land adj, Soothill Hall, 106-108, Oaks Road, Soothill, Batley, WF17 6LT
Postcode:	WF17 6LT

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	Yes

To Kirklees Council Reference 2023/93087 letter 27/11/23

I wish to object to the plan:

Application number 2023/62/93087/E
Last updated 08 December 2023
Applicant R Turner
Location Land adj, Soothill Hall, 106-108, Oaks Road, Soothill, Batley, WF17 6LT

for the following reasons:

General:
The "land adjacent to Soothill Hall" (incorrectly named land, see land register) is in fact the garden, social and recreational area for a total of 9 existing dwellings. These are residents their families, pets and visitors, all tenants of the proposer/owner/landlord. The main Hall has 5 residencies, there are the 3 rented terraced houses 100 -104 Oaks Road and the outbuilding conversion residence, registered as "The Barn".

Any new development, built in the garden, would intrude in terms of noise and light pollution and overlook many others privacy. Having a direct impact on the tranquillity of life on the existing residents, the surrounding community and wildlife. The important asset that is the "grounds south of Oaks Road" (as listed on the land registry) would be irrevocably damaged if built upon and destroy outside facilities to 9 families, which proved invaluable during the corona virus/covid lockdown and for any future contagious illnesses.

I as a long-term resident and tenant, 2009-present, oppose these proposal as do other tenants and residents I have spoken with. The gardens of Soothill Hall contributes to the setting of the Lower Soothill's rural aspect and the urban edge of Batley. It is an intrinsic part of the Soothill Hall residences and the main reason I choose to live there. The peace and quite and use of the garden and birds.

Failure to notify:

The proposer or Kirklees Council has failed to advertise & display notices stating an intension to build. The lampposts and gate ways near the site have had no planning notices erected. This does not allow the views of the further community, residents of Oaks Road, St Luke's, Lady Anne, Willow terrace & Close, to have full access to the planning process. As does accepting letters only on New Years Day (a bank holiday) but not on the close of the official public consultation date 04/01/2024 would. Who should have put the notices up?

Failure to notify or consult with tenants about the plans.

Mr Robert Turner has failed to inform any the residents, his tenants, of his plans. This will breach all of the 8 tenancy agreements. Residencies that he advertised as having "Victorian landscaped shared gardens". A new building in the grounds could result in conflicts between the new occupiers and existing tenant's of the Hall and houses (100-104)

Failure to address Local planning policy aims:

Have the proposers taken account of Kirklees Local Plan? Lp35 if so how?

Does the proposed "market 3 bedroomed property" fill the accommodation most need? Or is small occupancy rented accommodation with access to outdoor space a priority?

The proposers have failed to refer to section 14.1 of the Conservation heritage asset. Being a proposed new build in a conservation area. I believe that Soothill Hall is a historical important undiscovered gem that should be "conserved for future generations". Therefore a pause for investigation by the council and the West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory service would be required. I had inform the proposer of my research into historical connections to the Hall, which they have failed to inform or address in their plans. I believe Soothill (as in reference to recent postal district) is named such after Soothill Hall.

The proposer/owner/landlord has previously failed to complete and the council failed to check previous planning for completion of "The Barn". The two additional parking spaces to be provided to residents as part of the out-building reproposing, have not been built.

Although the proposer has done very little/few repairs and replacements to the Hall, changes have been made that I believe contravene the conservation policy. Rebuilding the chimney, lowering it, replacing old glazed pots with modern terracotta ones. The tearing down of the 3 old asbestos garages. Was permission needed/sort and granted?

Tenants used to be able to rent the garages but a new breeze block double garage (in

keeping with nothing) was built for the Owners who are on-site Landlords that live in “The Barn”. They have also failed to maintain properly the advertised gardens for the last 8 years. Leaving the paths overgrown, mossy and slippery when frozen and a hazardous to the tenants use of the garden and general safety of guests.

Part1 of 2