

## DC Admin

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 13 October 2024 17:56  
**To:** DC Admin  
**Cc:** 'Helen Whitworth'  
**Subject:** 168 Scholes Lane, Scholes, Cleckheaton BD19 6LX - Application number 2024/92316

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing regarding the above application number as the owner of 164 Scholes Lane, Scholes, Cleckheaton BD19 6LX as, if passed, the proposed residential development could impact my property so I would like to raise some queries/concerns that I have:

1.) I would like to understand where it is intended that the proposed dwelling will be connected to the sewer system. The reason I ask is that I understand my late father agreed that the owner of 168 Scholes Lane could run a single sewage pipe from their property across the boundary between 168 and 164 to a small junction which then connects to the drainage system of 164, before connecting to the mains sewer. This was an informal agreement.

I am, therefore, concerned that if permission is granted and intention would be to connect the proposed dwelling to the existing single sewage pipe. This will not support another dwelling and could lead to blockages and potentially raw sewage leaking onto my land.

2.) The plans propose the demolition of the existing garage which is a very old dry stone wall structure and is a habitat for nature, especially birds and bats. It also forms part of the boundary between 168 and 164 and provides privacy for 164 from 168 which is in an elevated position. I would like to understand what will be put in its place, considering this is a conservation area, to protect the privacy of 164 and what conditions will be put in place to protect the nature and wildlife it supports.

3.) The plans and drawings do not accurately reflect the building footprint of 164 as this has recently been developed and a double height extension added to the back (planning reference 2022/62/91435/E) which is closer to the boundary with 168. I would expect this to be considered and also the distance of the property from the Kirklees Way which runs the length of the boundary to the south.

4.) Given that 168 is in an elevated position relative to 164, I would want assurance that any water run off created by the new driveway would not cause an issue to 164. Currently most of the land earmarked for the proposed dwelling is used as a vegetable patch and, therefore, any rainwater soaks away which it wouldn't be able to do if hitting a surface such as tarmac.

5.) I have a well-established beech hedge running along the boundary between 164 and 168 which was planted around 50 years ago. The proposed parking area for two cars is very close to the boundary, I would want consideration to be given to the hedges root spread so that any building work would not damage or kill the hedge. This hedge creates privacy to the rear of 164.

Yours faithfully,