

From:
Sent: 10 Julv 2024 13:55
To:
Subject: Planning application 2024/91593

an objection

This application is for the erection of yet another building on the site of 410/412 Birkby Road.

Two questions on the application form in the section “Trees and Hedges” ask if there are trees and hedges on the proposed site and are there trees and hedges on land adjacent to the proposed development.

Both questions have ‘No’ incorrectly given as the answer

The Consultation Response from Kirklees Trees states correctly that the site is heavily constrained by trees most of which are protected by TPO 14/75. There is a holding objection until an Arboricultural assessment has taken place.

Before the previous 410 was demolished (to make way for the current and much larger property) strict building conditions were put in place to protect the very same TPO area within the grounds of 410 as follows-

A previous planning application for 410 (2013/70/93405) the site location plan includes a large area hatched in red.

A condition for approval was put in place as follows:-

No buildings or extensions in the red hatched area. Reason- To maintain effective control over the site in the interest of protecting the mature trees covered by the TPO.

The detached outbuilding in the current application is clearly 100% sited in the red hatched area referred to above. See attached photograph of the red hatched area.

There needs to be consistency in application of conditions . The TPO area is still there therefore the wording in italics above must still be valid for this current application . If not, it must be asked why it was deemed necessary in the 2013 application above and not now.

ALSO two other changes to what has been approved on previous applications have now appeared on the proposed site plan and yet have not been formally applied for in this current application:-

1. Hard standing for 4 cars has moved from in front of 410 house and is now shown in what was previously designated a lawned area . It is now directly adjacent to the Tree Protection area on the eastern boundary of the site, possibly encroaching it. To move car parking to this area would mean removing probably the last remaining non-concreted/paved over or built on area on the whole of the flat portion of the 410/412 site, as the site falls away on both the eastern and northern boundaries (very steeply on the northern boundary)

2. To the rear of both 410 and 412 on the northern boundary- again adjacent to the Tree Protection area- there are now 2 'squares' showing by the steps of each. What do these squares signify? Additional buildings?

The other properties along the single track lane and adjacent properties have already had 33 MONTHS of dust, mud, noise, dirt, 20 ton vehicles, access lane dug up 3 times once rupturing a gas main , property damaged and daily disruption and work is still unfinished without this additional application . This amount of disruption for surrounding properties can not and should not be classed as 'temporary' - Temporary is another definition of ' brief' or 'limited time'. The length of time this ongoing development is taking , with more if this current application is approved can no way be classed as brief or limited

WHEN are applications to develop this site going to end - a site that had its Permitted Development Rights removed many years ago.

What was the point of removing the PDR's when no one at Planning appears to be looking at the whole picture and seen what has been added and added and added as piecemeal applications in order to obtain approval. All what has been added and still being applied for gives every impression of being the actual intention for the 410/412 site all along.

