

74 Hall Ing Lane  
Honley  
Holmfirth  
HD9 6QR

Dear Sirs

We would like to express our concerns over the proposed development at Hollinhurst Farm, Hall Ing Lane, Honley (Ref 2024/93594). The development is situated immediately adjacent to the northern boundary of our property, 74 Hall Ing Lane (note shown incorrectly as No. 76 on ordnance survey maps). The application is a variation of previous planning submission Ref 2018/62/92754/W and does not appear to address previous concerns or that of neighbouring properties.

Our concerns are as follows;

**Proximity** - Plot 8 is situated directly opposite our boundary and facing our property. We understand that the UDP BE12 guidance is that a minimum offset of 10.5m should apply between a building (with windows on elevation ) and boundary to undeveloped land. Whilst there is an improvement since previous application the property is only situated 8m from our boundary. We also note that the redline boundary is shown incorrectly on the site plan and the 'hedge' indicated is within our ownership and confirmed by our deeds.

The plan layout for Plot 8 indicates that the primary inhabited rooms (kitchen, lounge, study and master bedroom) are situated on the elevation facing our property.

**Glazing** - The rear elevation facing our property is extensively glazed with 31 windows. These include 4 no. full height patio doors / windows to the Gym, Study, Lounge and Games Room and full height glazing to the master bedroom. The latter is of particular concern as anyone entering the bedroom will unavoidably look down into our garden below. Considering the proximity of the property to the boundary this will be intrusive.

#### **Other Comments**

Reviewing the planning documentation, it was difficult not to ignore the following aspects of the development which stand out. I'm sure these will be picked up as part of the planning process by council consultees and stakeholders.

#### **Access**

The issues of access to the site were raised as part of the local plan submission. The steep access to the site seems to have been ignored by the developer's proposals. The plan within the revised Transport Assessment and Road Longitudinal Section revised indicates an access road

gradient of **1:10.5**. A gradient of this magnitude would not normally be accepted for adopted highways or under Building Regulations Part M for main site pedestrian access. A gradient of 1:20 being the typical maximum. The gradient would not normally be acceptable for refuse vehicle access or pedestrians based on Kirklees Councils Highway Design Standards.

Allowance has been made for external parking for 3 cars per household which will result in a high number of vehicle trips considering the access problems highlighted above.

The Transport Assessment also make no reference to the restricted sightlines at the Junction of Southwood Avenue and Hall Ing Lane. These have been made worse since the previous planning application with the construction of the hard boundary wall at No. 68 which further restricts visibility. Hall Ing Lane is used as a cut through (to avoid using Station Road) during peak times and vehicles generally exceed the speed limit.

### **Drainage**

The drainage strategy is contradictory with the summary stating that the drainage for the site will discharge surface water to 'surface water sewers' on Southwood Avenue which are not known to exist. Latter in the same report connection is proposed to the Yorkshire Water Combined Sewer on Southwood Avenue. This does not represent a sustainable drainage approach.

Due to the gradient of the access road there would be a risk that gullies would be bypassed by flows potentially leading to flooding on Southwood Avenue which is relatively flat.

Since the previous application there has been an increase in the frequency of surface water flooding of lower Gynn Lane (junction of Gynn Lane / Marsh Platt) in proximity of the electrical sub-station. Presently the development site does not contribute directly to the drainage systems on Hall Ing / Gynn Lane but would under these proposals and likely increase flood risk. Please see below photos of recent flooding incidents on Lower Gynn Lane (January 2025).

### **Visual Impact**

The elevations for plots 1-3 indicate significant retainment split between a number of walls to retain a total height of 5.4m. The overall impression however would be of a single wall. This will have a significant visual impact on the landscape which occupies a prominent position in the valley.

Finally the planning officer's report associated with previous application 2018/62/92754/W raised concerns with the development (noted to be recorded on Anite). The current proposals are not significantly different in nature.

Yours Sincerely

Photos of Flooding on Lower Gynn Lane



