

# KIRKLEES METROPOLITAN COUNCIL

## PLANNING SERVICE

### UPDATE OF LIST OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS TO BE DECIDED BY

### PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE HEAVY WOOLEN

14 JUNE 2016

---

2016/62/90020/E

PAGE 18

#### DEMOLITION OF EXISTING HOTEL AND ERECTION OF 15 DWELLINGS

#### THE WHITCLIFFE HOTEL, PROSPECT ROAD, CLECKHEATON, BD19 3HD

##### Amended Plans

An amended plan has been received showing a revision to the proposed access arrangements. The proposed revision is for the widening of the Unnamed Access Road to 4.5 metres for an extended length of 20 metres into the site from its junction with Prospect Road, and the provision of a passing place at a distance of approximately 40 metres into the site from the junction. K.C. Highways Development Management (HDM) has assessed the revised plans and raised no objections.

The K.C. Public Rights of Way section (PROW) requested clarification on the width of the proposed footpath. The existing footpath measures 1.3 metres which would remain as part of the access improvements; with the footpath offset to allow for the road widening and passing bay. PROW advises a scheme for the physical prevention of parking on the footpath is submitted, which can be addressed via condition.

The proposed revisions to the access would affect the adjacent Prospect Mill Development. Planning permission has been granted for the conversion of the mill into 42 apartments pursuant to application Ref 2009/92304. The implication is that 2no visitor parking spaces approved to serve the mill conversion would be displaced to accommodate the proposed passing place to serve this development. HDM have assessed this matter and have concluded that there is sufficient capacity on-street to accommodate the two displaced visitor spaces. Accordingly no objections are raised to the proposed access improvement works.

##### Procedure

The adjacent Prospect Mill site is within the ownership of the applicant and a corresponding amended red line and blue line boundary has been received to reflect the revisions to the proposed access arrangements. As the adjoining site is within the ownership of the applicant, no third parties would be prejudiced by the proposed revision to the redline boundary for access purposes.

## **7. REPRESENTATIONS**

Two further representations have been received, including comments from Councillor Kath Pinnock. The main concerns raised are summarised below;

The access improvements show car parking to serve the proposed development outside of the red line.

**Response:** This has been addressed through the submission of an amended red line boundary.

The boundary wall cannot be moved back to allow a passing place or visitor car parking or allow the access road to be widened as to do so would lead to a shortfall in parking provision to serve the adjacent Prospect Mills development. This adjacent development proposed 51 car parking spaces. Whilst not all 13 car parking spaces associated with the Prospect Mill development will be lost approximately 10 will disappear if the development is approved. That represents a shortfall of 20% and is not something highways would have approved.

**Response:** The proposal for two passing places has been superseded by the proposal for one passing place and the widening of the first 20 metres of the site. This will displace two car parking spaces and HDM consider there is sufficient capacity on-street to accommodate the two displaced visitor spaces.

Councillor Kath Pinnock has made the following comments:

"I have read the report being considered at planning committee on Tuesday. I am very concerned that a crucial piece of information is not either on the plans that have been submitted or contained within the officers' report.

This is in relation to the proposed passing place. It has obviously been agreed by planners and highways officers that a passing place along this 85 m single track road is essential. However, there are no details of how this will be achieved.

It is not as straightforward as it would appear to be when illustrated on a 2D plan.

There are three major issues:

1. There is a significant height difference between the access road to the site and the adjacent road next to the as yet undeveloped Prospect Mills. My crude estimate is that the difference is about 30cms at the place where the passing place is proposed. I would want to see details of how this would be achieved and a condition that this is done prior to any construction on site.
2. The PROW referred to is known locally as 'wappy nicket'. It is an ancient right of way. Some local histories allege that it is Saxon in origin. Any interference with this route will be strongly resisted by local people. It is an extremely well-used path. So if a passing place can be constructed in the area indicated on the plan, it would involve re-routing the path along the edge of the passing place. The boundary wall must also be re-built to ensure continuity of this feature.
3. The plan proposes taking down the last 10m of wall where the access to the site meets Prospect Road. I would want to see details of that junction

which would, as a consequence, have 2 accesses to Prospect Road right next to each other one serving the mill site which has permission for I think 60 properties all told and the hotel site with 20 (including the 2 properties already there). There is also the access from Victoria Avenue as well as Tofts Road. The report is silent about how this will be made safe for both pedestrians and traffic.

I would urge that the application is deferred until this crucial information is available”.

**Response:** Condition 6 of the committee report is a pre-commencement condition that requires the applicant to submit a scheme detailing the proposed improvements to the unnamed road leading between Prospect Road and the application site including widening of the access, provision of a passing place, and adjacent footways. The scheme is to include full sections, drainage works, street lighting, signing, surface finishes and the treatment of sight lines, together with an independent safety audit.

## **9. RECOMMENDATION**

### **Additional Condition**

16. No development shall take place until a scheme for the physical prevention of parking on the realigned footpath has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the scheme so approved shall be implemented before any dwelling is first occupied.

### **Amended Plans Table**

This recommendation is based on the following plans and specifications schedule:-

<b>Plan Type</b>	<b>Reference</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Date Received</b>
Location Plan	02	B	13.06.16
Topographical Survey	1768/001		04.04.16
Proposed Layout	PL/001	G	20.05.16
Proposed Access Arrangements	03	D	10.06.16
Proposed Sections	PL/002		20.05.16
House Type A	A/01		04.04.16
House Type B	B/01		04.04.16
House Type C	C/01		04.04.16
House Type D	D/01		20.05.16
Design and Access Statement			07.01.15
Transport Assessment			07.01.15
Bat Survey			07.01.15
Noise Report			07.01.15
Phase I Contamination Report			07.01.15
Arboricultural Report	11968/TT		07.01.15
Coal Authority Mining Report	51000700699001		07.01.15

**ERECTION OF EXTENSION TO EXISTING GLASSHOUSES****W.S BENTLEYS, CLIFFE HILL NURSERIES, CLIFFE LANE, GOMERSAL,  
BD19 4SX****9. RECOMMENDATION**

Two additional conditions are recommended:

10. The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until a Traffic Management and Routing Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved Traffic Management and Routing Plan shall thereafter be implemented and maintained at all times whilst the development is operational.

11. A scheme detailing surface water drainage works shall be submitted to and approved in writing before development commences. The drainage scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the extension is first brought into use and thereafter retained.

**ERECTION OF DETACHED DWELLING****ADJ 6, BARNSELY ROAD, FLOCKTON, HUDDERSFIELD, WF4 4DW****8. ASSESSMENT**

An additional plan was received on 3 June 2016 showing an amended location plan to allow for visibility for access. The amended plan also shows the visibility splays and layout of the proposed dwelling as shown on the previous plan received on 27 May 2016.

**9. RECOMMENDATION**

Amended plans table.

This recommendation is based on the following plans and specifications schedule:-

<b>Plan Type</b>	<b>Reference</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Date Received</b>
Location plan, block plan and proposed layout.	BG/P02/2D	2	3/06/16
Proposed elevations and floor plans.	BG/P02/1	1	10/03/15
Design and access	(amended)	2	14/04/16

<b>Plan Type</b>	<b>Reference</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Date Received</b>
statement.			
Coal Mining Risk Assessment			23/03/15
Supporting information	Letter to planning	1	10/08/15
Supporting information	Photographic survey	1	10/08/15
Site plan	P02-3(3)	1	10/08/15
Highways statement	Letter to Highways	1	14/02/16
Sightlines plan and amended layout.	1/500	1	27/05/16
Highways technical statement.	HY Consulting LTD	1	27/05/16

---

**2016/49/91013/E**

**PAGE 101**

## **FORMATION OF WHEEL PARK**

### **RECREATION GROUND ADJ, BURTON ACRES LANE, Highburton, HUDDERSFIELD**

#### **7. REPRESENTATIONS**

A further 19 representations have been received on this application. 18 of these comments raise concern that members of the committee will not be undertaking a site visit, with individuals requesting that the application is deferred until a site visit has been made by the committee.

Ward Councillor John Taylor has also made a further request for a site visit to be carried out by members.

A further representation has been made in relation to the noise report submitted by the objectors, raising concern that a copy of this report has not been circulated to members of the committee. They also requested the opportunity to submit a further response from their noise consultants however nothing has been received.

---