

About the application

Application number: 2024/91260	
What is the application for?:	Variation of condition 2 (plans and specifications) and 35 (removal of permitted
Address of the site or building:	Land at, Merchant Fields Farm, off Hunsworth Lane, Cleckheaton
Postcode:	

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	Yes
<p>I object to yet another application by Harron homes for another attempt at a new devised house design application.</p> <p>Since initial planning application in 2019 -Fooding, Increased Traffic road congestion & Environmental issues have increased and changed for the worse so much since HH original applications in</p> <p>HH are still wanting house design changes. Reducing 4 beds by 10 and making 10 more 3 beds on top of existing numbers. At Kirklees Planning committee members stated no reduction in numbers of 4 beds as this type of 4 bedded homes were more needed.</p> <p>At this meeting (held also live online to public) The planning committee chairman clearly stated if plans were approved any further applications for any change of conditions agreed by HH should be brought back to the Planning committee. Why are Kirklees Planning dept not following this instruction? HH have tried 3 times now to change the original house plan designs then withdrew their application recently but now have resubmitted yet a new application ?? K Planning refused these changes.</p> <p>Land ownership currently an alleged legal dispute over land owned by a resident of merchants' field farm. That land on site documents to be sold by the Smith family to Harron homes. The Smith family claiming some land is theirs to sell to HH when a home owners land from Merchants farm land registry deeds shows the land isn't owned by Smiths. How can Kirklees council planning approve housing development plans on other people's land??? Do KCP not check land ownership documents before approving Planning ?</p> <p>Wouldn't this make the Planning application approval void if some land on plans is not owned by sellers or developers?</p> <p>In new plans submitted, some paths and roads are said to be made smaller due to larger house space designs? Space on the roads was raised and refused before the final developmen was pproved and it had to change as it was said waste refuse vehicles etc didn't have enough turning space, so could this be an issue again?</p>	

vehicles etc don't have enough turning space, so could this be an issue again?

In the plans, to me, the garden border of the new house and its proximity to the bungalow on merchants' farm appears unacceptable. It appears extremely intrusive to the existing bungalow, already refuse vehicles, postal, and delivery vehicles have turning difficulties at this exact location.

Flooding - On previous applications, Yorkshire Water objected and wouldn't sign off to the proposed 2 underground Water tanks to help with flood water coming off the site and down onto the existing houses around Brookfield and Balme road, YW stated they would be insufficient. As far as I am aware, nothing has been done to address YW objections? Who's going to empty the tanks when full?

Since the original application, flooding reports were undertaken in 2018/ we all know how more frequent we have sudden rain storms causing more flooding episodes than ever before and it's said this will continue with current climate changes. There must be a new independent up to date flood assessment completed due to length of time from original flood risk assessment and present day.

I am aware that HH are allegedly trying to negotiate buying a part of one of the merchants privately owned field space at side of development (Mazebrook). As HH are allegedly wanting to dig out large area so the overflow from the 2 underground flood water tanks. If correct is this HH acknowledging there is going to be flooding when the sites developed and that in fact the water tanks are inadequate as YW objections? and this is a way to catch it. Nothing about this is official at this point, but if correct, money talks and the owner of the field will likely be very tempted to sell this field as currently they don't use it.

However, I am intrigued on one of the new plans submitted in this exact area of the privately owned field there is a big blue area which doesn't have a description as to what it is, could this be the so called lake?? From overflow water tanks? What happens if lake overflows?

Residents of Brookfield and around Balme road have recurring flooding to their homes, are refused house insurance or have to pay extortionate house insurance due to repeated flooding to homes. Mortgages refused due to flooding. Merchants' fields site has always acted as a sponge soaking up lots of flood water which would otherwise have made residents living lower down and beyond flooding much worse. Hunsworth Road suffers more flooding than previously. It'll be much worse if this land developed. Kirklees council refused development on merchants' fields 4 times over the years due to risk of flooding.

At the bottom of the Mazebrook field just near the public footpath route, before and beyond the stream. New HH plans submitted show wooded picnic areas, benches, woodbark paths, play area etc. Knowing this area very well, it's completely unrealistic as the area becomes totally flooded during flash rainstorms or persistent rainfall and has done for years. Evidence of this are mature trees have fallen down here due to the saturated ground.

Recently due to persistent and flash rain flooding there has been a visible landslip next to the stream, from the higher up level farmer's field [one with horned cows in]. The farmer's fence is teetering on the ledge now. Mature trees on the landslip line here are very vulnerable to falling down here at any time.

It's 16 months since the development was approved. We all saw the contractors slash and burn the whole site destroying trees, bushes, hedges and importantly destroyed habitats for numerous wildlife animals and birds. The delays have enabled the fields to grow back and also see what wildlife have since returned to build their habitats on here again. Owls, foxes, herons, occasional deer, geese, ducks, kestrels can now be seen again daily. Should KP allow the slash and burn to happen yet again ? as this was illegal the first time yet KP did nothing about it. An up-to-date environmental wildlifeassessment should be undertaken ordered by Kirklees