

Design/structure - this is not in character with the houses within the immediate area, therefore the development will not enhance but in fact would be a 'blot on the landscape'! [LP24 (a)]. The height is a concern regarding the obscuring of natural light, especially in relation two of the houses. Adjacent house (no 28), as this is aligned with the dwellings they will block out a good amount of light through the rooflights. Adjacent house (no44), because the dwellings are set further back than the existing house, it will affect considerably the amount of natural light in the afternoon/early evenings, especially in spring and summer, and inevitably will reduce their outlook considerably. Additionally, because the dwellings are three storeys I feel this would not be appropriate for many people [LP24 (b)].

Furthermore, although the distance between the dwellings and the opposite semi-detached houses is over the minimum 21 metres, I feel given the imposing structure of the dwellings, especially for number 19, this is inadequate. Also regarding the minimum 21 metre distance, this has not been adhered to in relation to the back of the dwellings which face the back windows of numbers 97 and 99 Wellhouse Lane, there is a shortfall of between 4 and 5 metres [LP24]. However, as I mentioned earlier given the height of the dwellings I feel a longer distance would be appropriate.

Regarding the landscaping aspect, the irreplaceable loss of habitat should have been avoided [LP24 (i)]

Gates - within the plan(s) there are indications to install five potential 1000mm high gates through the boundary wall, this would lead on to private land which is owned by the residents of 95, 97 and 99 Wellhouse Lane and technically are their back gardens, and although a moot point, the gate access would serve no advantage!

Car parking - NPPF Section 9, P116 and P117(c) – given that the majority of the road on Robin Royd Lane is less than the standard width and the dwellings are in a cul-de-sac, the quantity of houses, although there are two off the road car parking spaces, I feel would cause major problems for all concerned. Firstly, realistically there would be ten cars and as these are three bedroomed houses the potential for the additional car per house is the norm these days, not to mention guests/relations visiting, deliveries etc. - where would they park? Also, as the car parking spaces are tandem positioned, less practical and convenient as the side by side position, I feel this would cause residents to leave their cars parked on the street which would hinder/obstruct the ability of the residents opposite to manoeuvre their cars/caravan safely. Additionally, as the lane leads to a field entrance, any parked cars would again hinder or obstruct farm vehicles, horse owners' vehicles including horse boxes.

Furthermore, the path connecting Robin Royd Lane onto Wellhouse Lane is a very popular walkway for adults and children alike and is a regular school route for many. So with the addition of realistically ten or more cars setting off, especially at peak times, the risk of an accident(s) increases exponentially!

Habitat - as per the aerial image of the land, it can be seen that this was a lush mini forest which had been growing for decades. I have lived nearby for the best part of 36 years and have watched and listened to the many sounds of birds, squirrels and bats as well as appreciating the various species of trees, but then the applicant/developer cleared the land without preplanning appraisals or consulting any of the appropriate organisations, which to me shows a blatant disregard for nature, wildlife and the environment or indeed governmental policies and procedures as outlined in the National Policy Planning Framework policies, and as stated in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report ER-8481-01 on page 22 – P8(c), P10, Section 11, P125, P187, P192, P193 and Kirklees Local Plan policies as set out in British Standard BS 5837, Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction Recommendations. If he had taken such measures the significant loss of habitat would have been avoided. [LP33]

Therefore with reference to, in particular NPPF paragraph 193, I feel it would be pertinent to refuse planning as no amount of on-site or off-site

BNG units would compensate for the decimation of an entire ecosystem, a mini forest which included various species of trees, plants and was home to many species of birds, squirrels, bats, insects etc. and which gave so much to the health and well being to the area.

Finally, may I propose that the existing house be renovated, as I understand, contrary to one of the applicant statements, that it is not at the 'end of it's life cycle' although built in the late 1800's, just a few years after the 'adjoining' house (no 44), it is of sound structure. Surely it would be environmentally logical i.e. less carbon footprint. The rear would be landscaped accordingly and car parking space(s) to the side. As this is a quiet area I feel the remainder of the land would be ideal to be made into allotments, bordered by trees, where people can come together. [NPPF Section 8 P96 (a) and (c)].

Alternatively, I feel in order to avoid some of the issues raised and to replenish the majority of the habitat, that the only viable option is a moderately sized two storey, three bedroomed house.

Thank you!