

Stage 4 General Matters

Matter 29 – Urban Green Space and other open spaces

p) Are the boundaries of the following sites robustly based and justified, having regard to representations made by landowners?

UGS1251 - Meltham Pleasure Grounds, Meltham

I write to you with reference to the afore mentioned site UGS1251 and the extension of its boundary to include some land that I own.

The piece of land that I own used to be one plot, but because of an adverse possession claim a number of years ago it has now been split into 3 plots.

I own the 2 outer plots and the middle plot is now the back garden of number 93 Holmfirth Road, Meltham.

The starting point for my appeal statement would be that I don't want any of my land to be designated as Urban Green Space because of the implications and restrictions for future use that this would have, however as with most things in life a compromise is often the best way forward.

In view of this, I had a meeting with Andrea Lane and Steven Wright of Kirklees Council Planning Policy Group on the 16th of March 2017 to discuss my situation, where I put forward the compromise of letting the plot of land (1) that joins directly onto the current Urban Green Space become Urban Green Space, but letting the plot (2) that joins directly onto Holmfirth Road remaining in its current undesignated state.

Both Andrea and Steven had been to view the site the day before the meeting and given its layout and current uses etc they agreed with the proposal of a compromise as set out above.

The nature of the whole site is that it is a former quarry and that plot 1 is semi-landlocked and so would have limited future use for me, but plot 2 was used as a builders yard by its previous owner since 1976 and by myself in connection with my tree surgery business for storing logs, woodchip and vehicles etc.

Given the potential threat of losing my land to become Urban Green Space, I am now in the process of submitting a planning application for housing on plot 2. I understand that in line with Planning Policy Guidance notes this would be regarded as a *windfall site* (the site is 0.25 ha) and something the government is keen to encourage to bolster housing stock. Understandably any application would have to be judged on its own merits.

In summary to answer the question of 'Are the boundaries of the following sites robustly based and justified, having regard to representations made by landowners?' In its current form the answer is no, but with the compromise as set out above, then a balance of interests is achieved.

Thank you for taking the time to review this appeal statement.

Kind regards

Adrian Saxton

Stage 4 General Matters

Matter 29 – Urban Green Space and other open spaces

p) Are the boundaries of the following sites robustly based and justified, having regard to representations made by landowners?

UGS1251 - Meltham Pleasure Grounds, Meltham



Stage 4 General Matters

Matter 29 – Urban Green Space and other open spaces

p) Are the boundaries of the following sites robustly based and justified, having regard to representations made by landowners?

UGS1251 - Meltham Pleasure Grounds, Meltham

