
Sent: Monday, April 29, 2024 4:52 PM
To: Nicole Helliwell <Nicole.Helliwell@kirklees.gov.uk>
Subject: Planning Application 2023/62/93388/E : COGRI Group

Dear Ms Helliwell

I visited the Council Offices on 17 April and was assured, under Council rules, that I would receive a call back within five working days to discuss issues surrounding the above application. To-date I haven't been contacted and am therefore following this up by email.

I am the owner of the private drive over which the Cogri Group accesses its business. This includes all industrial activity including large transport vehicles on an access basis only. My address is . Despite this legal stance, there is a history of the Council not informing us of planning applications and their effects which has resulted in a

number of problems. Once again we have not been informed, despite our land being directly affected.

I attach a letter from us to Planning dated 19 March 2018 which outlines the history of this ever-expanding business and its detrimental effects on its immediate neighbours, and conservation area. Back then planning was approved on the assurances by the CORGI Group that it would not result in an increased volume or type of vehicular activity visiting or accessing the site via our land. The reality has been quite different. Separately I am forwarding sample photo evidence of exceptionally large transport vehicles, either parked up on our drive for hours at a time, or blocking the route both ways. As the owners of the drive our neighbours are raising concerns with us about being thwarted in their legal right to access, by those that do not have the authority to hamper movement. CORGI's regular blocking of the drive and overspill also carries serious health and safety issues as emergency vehicles cannot automatically access it. Requests to CORGI to manage its traffic are ignored; likewise requests to clear up their detritus that regularly flies onto and settles on our drive.

Given the current planning application I am seeking assurances that the Council in its deliberations, will demand a re-configuration of traffic flow and reduced traffic down our private drive. The situation has become untenable and something needs to happen. The CORGI group is a large industrial complex sitting in the heart of a village affecting many households and I trust the Council will give due consideration to the village as a whole.

I understand that emails are required to be responded to within 10 working days. I would welcome a meeting with you and can be contacted on _____ to set something up. Thank you.

With regards,

Kirklees Council
Planning
Investment and Regeneration Service
PO Box B93, Civic Centre 3
Off Market Street
Huddersfield HD1 2JR

19 March 2018

Dear Sir/Madam

**Ref: 2018/90027 : Cogri Group Ltd, Dene House, North Road, Kirkburton Huddersfield HD8 ORW
Demolition of existing unit and erection of replacement unit (within a conservation area)**

We wish to submit the following comments on the above application:

The Planning Heritage and Design & Access Statement states that the application site lies on the B6116 North Road of Kirkburton (Context para 7) and that access to the site remains the same as the current arrangements, i.e. off North Road (Access para 15). This isn't totally correct.

Context

Whilst the reception office and visitors car park fronts the B6116, staff vehicular and all industrial related activity including large transport vehicles is accessed off a private driveway owned by , on an access only basis.

We therefore have a strong interest in the plans, yet haven't received written notification of the application, as sent to other neighbouring properties. There are no public notices on the B6116 North Road. The notice is on our private driveway which is accessed by only the applicant and two other properties that lead off our drive.

Use Class

The application states that the existing industrial unit and the proposed industrial unit are for storage of machinery. However, the application at box 18 describes the use class as A1 – shops. Presumably therefore this would suggest that a change of use application is needed from Class A to Class B.

Size of Building

The proposed replacement industrial unit would border onto a wooded valley setting within a conservation area and access to the unit is directly from our private drive which otherwise only serves private dwellings.

-cont-

Our chief concern is that the proposed unit would be considerably larger than the existing unit and would be overly dominant in its setting. Whilst it is one metre higher at the apex, it is considerably higher at all other points and greater in volume. Basically, it looks huge compared with the existing unit and damages the aesthetics of the privately owned setting and conservation area.

Continued Access

The significant increase in the area and volume of the proposed replacement unit does raise concerns about consequent increases in vehicular traffic and access problems. In 2002/3 we submitted comments on the change of ownership to the current occupier. Unfortunately they were submitted after the closing date having not been sent notification of the application and could therefore not be considered. With the then change of ownership was an increase in parking spaces from about six to approx. 22. We would oppose any application that created additional pressure on access arrangements on our drive, both from our own point of view and that of our neighbours who have access over the drive.

We are pleased to see in the application and to hear from the applicant that there will be no increase in the volume or type of vehicular activity visiting or using the site. This is important because in that regard the site is already operating at full capacity and there have been overspill issues in the past.

Any development would need to ensure continued access off the private driveway under the existing arrangement.

Trees and Hedges

The application states in Box 15 that there are no trees that influence the development. That is not the case. We own two trees which overhang the existing industrial unit that the applicant wishes to replace. The trees are protected by Tree Preservation Order 7/1989, and are listed in the First Schedule as T8 (horse chestnut) and T9 (beech). The proposed unit could not be constructed without seriously impacting on these trees.

Grey Cladding

The applicant proposes grey cladding. We believe it should be possible to identify a finish more likely to blend into a garden and woodland setting. The use of metal cladding is at odds with the rural side of the development and its increasing use is becoming dominant

.

Summary

We appreciate the applicant's needs for a more secure unit and would be happy to see a new unit built of a similar size to the existing unit, with the caveats expressed.

Yours faithfully,