DCAdmin

From:
Sent: 20 July 2024 18:40
To: DCAdmin
Subject: Planning Application 2024/91725

Categories:

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to you with my concerns regarding the change of use application for 45 Manor Park, Mirfield WF14 0EW application 2024/91725

This is regarding the detrimental effects which I feel would arise for the current residents of Manor Park and Manor Drive.

The two roads consist of an area of housing largely constructed of bungalows, many of which are occupied by elderly residents.

Maor Park and Manor Drive are both narrow cul-de sacs, Manor Park already being designated as a no-through road due to traffic safety concerns.

Access via Manor Park is key to providing support for vulnerable residents, both in terms of the external support services they may require and access for wider family members.

These roads have already become more dangerous in recent years, due to

1. The number of occupier vehicles now needing to park on-street.
2. The use of Manor Park as a short cut by non-residents, despite the designation.
3. The regular use of the entrance to Manor Park as a stop off point for staff at John Cottons, especially at shift change times.
4. General increased traffic flow, causing reduced road surface quality, requiring regular maintenance.
5. The layout of the two roads in general, which especially in winter and other poor weather conditions can make navigating more challenging.

The exact location of the property itself is a particular concern. On street parking here is especially dangerous, as this is at a three-way merging point and means any on street parking can reduce visibility for vehicles coming from any one of the three directions.

The application itself states that there is off-street provision for four vehicles, plus a garage (sec 2.9). My concerns regarding this are –

1. There is not the specified amount of parking spaces available. In practical terms there are realistically two off street places at the property, and this was always the historic situation. While technically three

vehicle parking may possible, this would limit ease of access to each one and the property itself, also preventing access to the referenced garage space. The garage is not used as such and should therefore be omitted.

2. Due to the increased number of vehicles and the limited space available, this raises concerns around the number of vehicle movements involved with staff changeover plus use of the additional vehicle. Movements will not only be on arrivals & departures, but also around the further repositioning of vehicles, especially given the additional electric vehicle will require an off street place. At this specific location more movements will inevitably increase the risk of traffic incidents.
3. The application references three staff members on site at a time, plus an additional vehicle to be used for transporting residents. Although the application states a desire to encourage staff to use public transport, this is aspirational and does in no way reduce the potential for additional vehicles.
4. The application also references additional visits by professional visitors. Despite the wording of the application, the change of use will effectively have the potential to permit any number of additional professional visits from multiple agencies at any time. This is a significant change form a property under residential use, where there is largely a consistent volume of vehicles at such a property.
5. The application states that there are 'Normally no visits from family' (3.6), this again is aspirational and does not offer any comfort to residents that further detrimental traffic problems will not arise.
6. A comparison of current movements to proposed is provided (3.12). It should be noted that the current situation does not involve vehicles being present at the property all the time, that there are currently less vehicles involved than proposed and also that current owners regularly need to resort to on-street parking, meaning there is already a raised level of risk at this location. The proposed usage provides a best-case scenario, and *at a minimum* involves an increase of 1-2 additional vehicles, plus over 20% of additional movements.

In conclusion, the proposal presents an unrealistic scenario that does not address the specific issues seen on Manor Drive and offers no guarantees that outlined impacts would remain at the proposed level. It is inevitable further congestion problems will arise and that this change of use would result in serious detrimental effects for both the safety and accessibility of existing residents.

Regards,