Comment on Consultees Feedback: Why are KMC Planning continue to invest valuable resources by allowing the applicant to submit an incomplete application. The inadequacies of the application are clearly demonstrated by the following consultee responses.

Victorian Society: Strong Objection

- Any new building should have no greater footprint than the 1810 Hotel!
- No case for bedrooms – old precedent expired
- Toilets qualify, but the following do not qualify as a 'public benefit' justifying harm!
    - A free attraction
    - Mental health support FOC
- Significant concerns re harm from traffic volumes & deliveries introduced into the site:
    - Causing urbanisation of the heritage setting
    - Impeding the flow of all forms of traffic to the site
    - Impact upon ecology of the site & its setting, and heightened erosion

Historic England: Recommends withdrawal of application

- Key heritage asset. Comparable with Glastonbury Tor. Planned hilltop is unique in England
- Acid Grassland habitat is rare and should be protected
- Proposed benefits do not outweigh the harm; high policy threshold applies (Public benefit test NOT met)
- Claimed Public benefits unclear
- Impact of proposed development not clearly specified
- Supporting documentation incomplete
- Financial Management Plan & Vision Doc inconsistent
- Developer must deliver site wide management, interpretation, education & visitor amenities.
- Applicant appears not to understand implications of a CIC

Bio Net Gain: No comment

- Odd given surrounding natural environment and harming aspects of new development.

Flood Authority: Reject drainage proposals

- Point out strata & gradient of land, surrounding the proposed site, not suited to infiltration
- Requires attenuation tank capable of handling a 100yr flood event.
- Nature of the installation will necessarily involve extensive excavation into scheduled land to create underground storage & deep drain across the site, and down the hillside to Ashes lane

Museum & Galleries: Concerned

- Castle Hillfort is a site of overwhelming importance as a SAM
- A much loved symbol of Kirklees driving objections

Highways: No significant Input

- Appear to ignore major issues around road safety recognised in previous applications (yet application does not incorporate fresh mitigation)

Police Indicate requirement for high-level security measures

- High-level security measures recommended due to remote location of proposed development
- Recommendations are intrusive but would be required for H&S of GP, customers, visitors and staff
- Made more onerous in the event of the removal of the current security gate
- Intrusive nature of the significant lighting, surveillance cameras and door security introduce urban style measures inappropriate to the heritage site - Underlines the fact that the proposed development is inappropriate for the site!

This summary demonstrates the extent of objections relating to the application. They span across the major consultees relevant to the application.