

DC Admin

From:
Sent: 03 November 2024 21:13
To: DC Admin
Subject: Objection to Planning Application 2024/92727

I'm writing to formally **OBJECT** to the planning application **2024/92727**

Design / Planning

The design density of the development's South section (comprising 41 homes) seems to bear the majority of the pressure to meet the target of 67 new houses. This concentration does not appear to respect the existing neighbourhood—not only in house style but also in the density of homes near the adjacent area. A possible reason for this oversight may be that the properties on **Ashbourne View** have been disregarded. In the **Design and Access Statement** [ID 1060673], under "**Understanding the Place**" (page 11), there is no mention of the large, four- and five-bedroom homes with spacious front and back gardens. Given that this is the primary access point to the site, shouldn't it reflect some acknowledgment of the existing homes? Or has this omission been an attempt to bypass planning scrutiny? The homes on Ashbourne view and Ashbourne Croft are large detached with large plots but the estate which is accessed from here are mostly townhouses/mews/semi's and so therefore does not respect/reflect the adjacent neighbourhood.

In alignment with the previous approved Redrow application, the site was designed to balance traffic flow by distributing access points evenly between the northern and southern sections. Each section was allocated an equal number of plots—23 houses per section—resulting in a manageable total of 46 houses, thus facilitating shared traffic distribution and minimising congestion.

Green space / public open space

In reference to the Design and Access Statement [ID 1060673] on page 30, the North site includes access to a historic house buffer, a requirement for the listed Grade II building. Consequently, this allocation has left the South site without green space or access. Due to the retaining wall and density of houses there is no access from the North to the South for children which would then mean they will have to walk through the existing estate through what will now be busy roads in order to access open play spaces. Could we consider incorporating green spaces or play areas on the South site, drawing inspiration from the **approved Redrow** proposal Ref:2014/61/91242/E Block plan [id 653268]

Contrary to the observation on page 3 of the Kirklees Council Public Health document, **Access to open and green** spaces which states, "It is clear from the plans that

adequate consideration has been given to landscaping and biodiversity across the development," I disagree with this assessment. Upon review, the South site development lacks connectivity to the North site and demonstrates a complete lack of attention to landscaping, biodiversity, or open green space.

Although the PH document requests "edible fruit-bearing trees," I believe the residents would likely prefer green open spaces similar to those available at the unconnected North site.

Further Western Expansion

Maintaining complete transparency with current residents is crucial for the future, as emphasised in the *Design and Access Statement [id 1060673]*, page 24, which notes: "Roads have been realigned to incorporate potential future access to the west." This site should not act as a precursor for extensive further development, as the proposed expansion will strain the council's infrastructure under present conditions.

Existing roadways

The current road design presents significant hazards, particularly at the left turn from Quaker Lane onto Ashbourne View, where the adverse camber makes the bend barely suitable for the current 18 residences, let alone the additional 41 proposed. It seems inevitable that, without changes, a vehicle will eventually breach the fence of house number 141. Furthermore, traveling up Quaker Lane near property 134 and the exit from Ashbourne View, there is a blind summit. With the anticipated increase in traffic both during and after the proposed development, the risk of a serious accident is substantial.

20% Affordable Housing

The council should critically examine the **Financial Viability Assessment** General [ID 1061901] if there is a possibility that this document could lead developers to disregard the council's intentions to provide affordable housing for residents; failing to do so risks undermining community welfare.

The council promptly suggested cutting the allocation from 20% to 10% (KC Public Health document, pages 2-3, Housing), reflecting a 50% reduction and signalling its reluctance to fully address essential needs. Remain steadfast and continue advocating for the vital need for affordable housing must be the highest priority.

Existing Council Services

Currently, there are insufficient provisions for waste removal, we are unable to pay for garden waste removal due to the lack of available services. Additionally, one waste disposal site has already closed (Nab Lane Birstall) due to council seeking savings.

Coal Mining

After reading the coal authorities response we are very concerned about the immediate and long term danger/damage excavating this site could cause. What will be put into place to protect existing residents? Will either the builder or the council provide insurance to the existing residents? If their homes/land have future issues with subsidence due to the

excavation will they pay for the repairs? The report also suggests the council acquires a further report on the potential of gas hazards 'planning authorities should seek their own technical advise on the gas hazards that may exist' We would also like this to be discussed further with existing residents as to the danger of excavating this site and the effects it could have on our health. We would like to suggest a consultation meeting to discuss further as pages and pages of technical documents does not translate easily to the average person whose health and homes this will ultimately effect.

Drainage

We are concerned that the development will eliminate natural soakaways, replacing them with large, oversized concrete footings (due to the site's former mining activity), tarmacked roadways and eventually, artificial lawned gardens and extensions (permitted development) once the houses are occupied and allowed to do what they want with their plots.

Funds

The builder has alluded that it is in the best interest of the council to allow the build to go ahead due to the increase in council tax. However the amount the council will receive from this estate is surly not enough to counteract the negatives it will impose on the local area and infrastructure. The amount Kirklees will receive will not cover the extra doctors, dentists, school places, road resurfacing, traffic calming, flood damage, that will be needed once these new houses are occupied. They have also stated the new housing bonus Kirklees will receive for giving the go ahead but did not mention that it would receive more if they actually built the affordable housing they should. If this is the only benefit from allowing this estate to go ahead it should be maximised and be insisted the full 20% be built. Can you confirm if these funds will be specifically allocated to Cleckheaton and not swallowed up into another area of Kirklees.

Schools

I do not understand how the amount of 6 extra spaces has come about. Is this just an algorithm? this is not a true reflection on what will actually happen. These houses are large family houses and will bring in many families from other areas. We would like this explaining further as we do not understand how the amount suggested to be paid by the builder is enough to sustain the school. This estate will be around for a very very long time how will the school support the existing and new children properly now and in the future with just a one off payment.

In the unfortunate circumstances that the above plans are to go ahead we would like more information on the following to limit the disruption to our lives.

Who will be the point of contact at Newett homes and the planning office at Kirklees for issues during construction.

Site Working Hours

Will construction work hours to take place from Monday to Friday, allowing existing residents a reprieve on weekends and ensuring they have at least two days of quiet?

Adjacent Site Cleaning

Weekly maintenance (cleaning) of roads and windows is essential. Furthermore, we require funds to be designated for refurbishing roads and sidewalks leading to key access points such as **Ashbourne View**. Ensuring road and pedestrian safety is of utmost importance as they are already crumbling away with many trip hazards and roads wearing down.

Phased Working Plans

Residents would like to see the construction phase plans to outline contractor parking to avoid builders parking on adjacent streets (to keep their cars and vans clean), which can lead to additional disruptions and impact traffic and safety (parking on the path).

Customer parking noting the showhouses are the first (largest) houses on both the north and south of the development can you ensure you have adequate provisions in place to mitigate people parking in front of the existing resident's houses and drives causing unnecessary further hazards.

If unable to complete work

Due to the abnormal land and heavy construction needed to put the land right to build on, what would happen in the event that once excavation has started the builder decides not to continue and leaves the land? Who is then responsible in returning it back to a green landscape? Will Newett homes be held responsible for returning the land back to a bio diverse and green space.

Summary

In summary this is too many homes on such a small estate being accessed from an existing estate whose roads will not be able to cope. We are also greatly concerned at the suggestion it has been left open for even further development this can not be allowed to happen.