

To all Members of the Planning Committee

You are hereby summoned to attend a meeting of the **PLANNING STANDING COMMITTEE** to be held at **HOLMFIRTH CIVIC HALL, HUDDERSFIELD ROAD, HOLMFIRTH HD9 3AS** on **MONDAY 7 MARCH 2022** at **700pm** to transact the following business: -

- AGENDA – (A)

Welcome

Open Session at Planning

7.00 pm

At the commencement of the meeting, there will be an open session lasting up to 15 minutes, for members of the public to address Members of the Committee in connection with planning applications to be considered at the meeting. This session allows both applicants and objectors to address Members. Any other information relating to items on the agenda will be considered as part of the agenda item.

Issues/concerns/information not related to any item on the agenda will be considered at a later date or referred to the appropriate body.

2122 198 Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960 amended by the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014 on 6 August 2014 7.15 pm

As Local (Parish and Town) Council meetings can now be recorded, the Chairman to check if any members of the public wish to record the meeting, to ensure reasonable facilities can be provided. The meeting is already being recorded by the Officer for public broadcast via the Holme Valley Parish Council YouTube channel.

2122 199 To accept apologies for absence 7.16 pm

2122 200 To receive Members’ and Officers’ personal and disclosable pecuniary interests in items on the agenda 7.17 pm

2122 201 To consider written requests for new DPI dispensations 7.18 pm

2122 202 To consider whether items on the agenda should be discussed in private session 7.19 pm

- Any recording to be halted during such items and members of the public asked to leave the meeting.

2122 203 To confirm the Minutes of the Previous Meeting 7.20 pm

- Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 7 February 2022, numbered 2122 181 – 2122 197 inclusive **(B)**

2122 204 Completed Kirklees Planning Applications List 7.21 pm

- To note List 2021/10 updated with the views of the Committee. **(C)**

Holme Valley Parish Council

- 2122 205** **New Planning Applications – Kirklees Council** **7.22 pm**
- To consider new or amended applications received by Kirklees Council from 1 February 2022 to 1 March 2022 inclusive – List 2122/11 enclosed **(D)**
- 2122 206** **Kirklees Council – Planning Officers’ Decisions** **8.20 pm**
- To note list of Decision Notices issued by Kirklees Council for the period 1 February 2022 to 1 March 2022 inclusive **(E)**
- 2122 207** **Neighbourhood Planning** **8.21 pm**
- i. - At the last Planning Committee Meeting, Members voted to supply a hard copy of the Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development Plan to all Councillors. The Deputy Clerk to report on options.
To consider, choosing the best option regarding the printing, binding and distribution of these documents.
 - ii. - The Committee Chair and Cllr Hogley have drafted a covering note from them both to accompany the Neighbourhood Plan being distributed to Councillors. To consider, approving this covering note. **(F)**
 - iii. - To note, the Deputy Clerk has promoted the Neighbourhood Development Plan via the Parish Council website, social media, and noticeboards, explaining how local people can access the Plan.
 - iv. - To note, reports from the Chair and Members regarding communication with Kirklees Planning Officers and Managers on the usage of the NDP by developers and how to promote further engagement. Cllr Blacka to report.
 - v. - To note, the Deputy Clerk has emailed Julie McDowell, Area and Neighbourhood Action Coordinator for Kirklees, regarding the timeframe for the £1.5m Small Centres Funding set aside for Holmfirth. Deputy Clerk to report.
- 2122 208** **Reviewing Parish Council Outcomes** **8.30 pm**
- At the last Planning Committee meeting, it was resolved that Members would endeavour to continuously review the work of the Parish Council in the light of the Neighbourhood Development Plan with a view to prioritising outcomes. These outcomes could subsequently constitute a focus for the Small Centres Funding (as above) or the Parish Council’s own expenditure.
- To consider, identifying specific targets for the Parish Council (or for the Planning Committee) based on the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan which would be part of actively focused work and campaigning.

Holme Valley Parish Council

- 2122 209** **Peak District National Park Authority** **8.40 pm**
- i. - To consider new or amended applications received by the Peak District National Park Authority Council from 1 February 2022 to 1 March 2022 inclusive – List 2122/3PD enclosed **(G)**
 - ii. - To consider a response by the Parish Council to the government’s [Landscapes Review – National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty](#) including specific reference to off-roading in protected landscapes. Chair to report.
 - iii. - To consider a response to the Peak District National Park Authority’s Development Management Practice Note Policy DMH1: New Affordable Housing, enclosed with covering email. **(Hi, Hii)**
- 2122 210** **Ongoing Highways campaigns** **8.50 pm**
- i. **Concerns of local residents regarding speeding and noise pollution Woodhead Road Holmbridge to Holme**
 - To note, there had been no further communication from Kirklees on this campaign issue since the last meeting.
 - ii. **Campaign for a Safer Magdale**
 - To note, there had been no further communication from Kirklees on this campaign issue since the last meeting.
 - iii. **Hade Edge Road Intersection**

To note, there had been no further communication from Kirklees on this campaign issue since the last meeting.
 - iv. **Burnlee Road Closure**
 - To note, the Deputy Clerk’s email to Mark Scarr at Kirklees Highways thanking him for the letter from the Structures team but insisting that the necessary works to see through the re-opening of the road are progressed with due haste. **(I)**
- 2122 211** **Ramsden Road** **8.53 pm**
- To note, the Deputy Clerk’s letter and supporting documentation, supplied by Cllr Wilson, sent to Will Acornley, Head of Operational Services at Kirklees Council regarding the lack of progress of the Public Space Protection Order on the lanes and byways around Ramsden, Brownhill, Riding Wood and Yateholme reservoirs. **(Ji, Jii, Jiii, Jiv)**
 - To further note, Will Acornley’s response to the above. **(K)**
 - To consider any further actions on this issue.

Holme Valley Parish Council

2122 212 **Footpaths**

8.55 pm

i. Bridge Lane to Sands

To note, that the Planning Inspectorate has made a decision on the footpath Bridge Lane to Sands. The decision, on 2 February 2022, is to modify the Definitive Map and Statement and record a Restricted Byway 231 between Bridge Lane and the Sands Recreation Ground. A Restricted Byway does not allow for the use of mechanised vehicles by the general public. The only vehicles permitted under this Order is the private use already in place for the Foundry, Holmfirth Cricket Club and Holmfirth Bowling Club.

ii. Temporary Traffic Regulation Order (TTRO) to Public Right of Way HOL 31/40, Honley
To note, the Deputy Clerk's email to Kirklees Highways regarding this proposed closure. **(L)**

iii. Holmfirth Footpath 60 Wolfstones

To note, there is still no outcome with regard to the public inquiry into the diversion of Holmfirth Footpath 60 at Wolfstones.

iv. Recording Historic Paths in England

To note, the government is to repeal the 2026 deadline for recording historic paths in England. As legislated, the deadline would have meant that on 1 January 2026, public rights over thousands of paths, which are public highways but not yet recorded as such, or not yet recorded correctly, would have been extinguished, with those rights being lost for ever. This has now been scrapped. However, alongside the repeal, the government also plans to introduce a "right to apply" for landowners to divert or extinguish rights of way in certain circumstances.

2122 213 **Publicising the work of Holme Valley Parish Council**

8.58 pm

- To consider, recent events or news that this Committee wishes to publicise via the press, Parish Council website or social media.

Close **9.00 pm**

Please note that timings on the agenda are given for guidance of the Chairman and Committee only and should not be taken as the time at which discussion of a particular item will commence.

Rich McGill

Rich McGill
Deputy Clerk

Holme Valley Parish Council
Holmfirth Civic Hall, Huddersfield Road, HOLMFIRTH HD9 3AS

Telephone: 01484 687460

Email: deputyclerk@holmevalleyparishcouncil.gov.uk

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING STANDING COMMITTEE HELD IN HOLMFIRTH CIVIC HALL
MONDAY 7 FEBRUARY 2022**

Those present:

Chairman: Cllr M Blacka

Councillors: P Colling, T Dixon, R Hogley, S Sheard, A Wilson

Officer: Mr R McGill (Deputy Clerk)

Welcome

- Cllr Blacka welcomed Members to this meeting of the Planning Standing Committee.

Open Session at Planning

- No members of the public were present for the public session.

2122 181 Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960 amended by the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014 on 6 August 2014

- Council meetings can now be recorded.
RESOLVED: The Officer was recording the meeting in video format for upload to the Parish Council's YouTube channel. No other people present wanted to record the meeting.

2122 182 To approve apologies for absence

- Cllr RP Dixon had tendered his apology.
RESOLVED: The reason for his apology was approved by the Committee.

2122 183 To receive Members' and Officers' disclosable personal and pecuniary interests in items on the agenda

- None were declared.

2122 184 To consider written requests for new DPI dispensations

- No written requests for new DPI dispensations had been received.

2122 185 To consider whether items on the agenda should be discussed in private session

- **RESOLVED:** Members decided that no items on the agenda should be discussed in private.

2122 186 To confirm the Minutes of the Previous Meeting

- **RESOLVED:** The Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 10 January 2022, numbered 2122 153 – 2122 170 inclusive were approved.

Holme Valley Parish Council

2122 187 Completed Planning Applications Lists

- **NOTED:** The Planning Committee noted List 2021/09 updated with the views of the Committee

2122 188 New Planning Applications – Kirklees Council

- Members considered new or amended applications received by Kirklees Council from 4 January 2022 to 1 February 2022 inclusive – List 2122/10.
RESOLVED: That the Standing Committee’s comments on the above applications be forwarded to Kirklees Council by the Deputy Clerk.

2122 189 Kirklees Council – Planning Officers’ Decisions

- **NOTED:** The Planning Standing Committee noted the list of Decision Notices issued by Kirklees Council for the period 4 January 2022 to 1 February 2022 inclusive

2122 190 Neighbourhood Planning

- **NOTED:** Members noted that the Parish Council had received three hardcopies of the “made” Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development Plan that can be accessed/loaned by Councillors or members of the public.
- The Committee considered a proposal to supply hard, paper copies of the Neighbourhood Development Plan to all Councillors.
RESOLVED: Members resolved that a hard, paper copy of the Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development Plan should be supplied to all Councillors as it is a foundation document underpinning the Council’s work. The Deputy Clerk would seek some quotations for the cost of printing 20+ copies.
RESOLVED: The copies for Members of the Parish Council would be accompanied by a covering note from the Committee Chair written with support of Committee Members.
RESOLVED: It was resolved that the Neighbourhood Development Plan should be further promoted. The Deputy Clerk would put notices on the noticeboard at The Civic and at Holmfirth toilets notifying the public of how to access the Neighbourhood Plan (via the internet, libraries, Parish Council office etc).
- The Committee suggested that the Parish Council should engage with Kirklees regarding development of a Streetscape Design Handbook.

Holme Valley Parish Council

- Councillor Hogley gave a report on what she saw as the next stages for the plan. She expressed the hope that Committees would continue to implement and review action plans arising from their reflections on the Neighbourhood Plan. Further, Councillor Hogley reported that she would like to see some specific campaign targets arising from the Plan, - for example, the establishment of more 20mph zones in built-up areas in the Holme Valley.
RESOLVED: All Members of the Planning Committee to review the Parish Council actions in the context of the Neighbourhood Plan with a view to prioritising outcomes. This would be an ongoing agenda item.
- The Committee Chair raised the subject of the £1.5m that will be made available to Holmfirth from Kirklees Council's Small Centres Funding. Kirklees' 'Your Voice Your Holmfirth' consultation had had limited engagement from Holme Valley people. The Committee suggested that the Parish Council should plan to engage with Kirklees Council as to how this money might be spent.
RESOLVED: The Deputy Clerk would find out a timeframe for the funding.
RESOLVED: The Committee would, as above, review the Parish Council's actions with a view to defining key outcomes at the next meeting of this Committee to be shared with Kirklees Council so as to open a dialogue about the Small Centres Investment Funding.
- Members reflected on how to integrate ongoing learning opportunities on the policies from the Neighbourhood Plan into the agendas of this Committee so that the Committee is better able to respond to planning applications with direct reference to the Neighbourhood Plan.
- Members hoped that opportunities would arise to engage directly with developers on the hopes and expectations of the Parish Council and the people of the Holme Valley as laid out in the Neighbourhood Plan regarding local developments.
RESOLVED: The Committee Chair and Cllr Hogley as former Chair of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group would separately contact members of the Kirklees Planning team for feedback on how Officers felt developers were engaging with the Neighbourhood Development Plan. Additionally, to inquire whether the Parish Council could be doing more to promote engagement.

2122 191 Peak District National Park Authority

- **NOTED:** Members noted that the government had published "Landscapes Review – National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty," its response to the Glover report. Members commented that it is fortunate that part of the Parish Council area falls within the Peak District National Park.
The Chair highlighted the report's hope to promote greater diversity of people using the national park and other local, rural landscapes.
Members would respond individually to the accompanying consultation with regard to the Glover report.

2122 192 Ongoing Highways campaigns

Concerns of local residents regarding speeding and noise pollution Woodhead Road Holmbridge to Holme

- The Deputy Clerk reported that, following repeated requests for updates on this campaign, with support from the Committee Chair, he had 31/01/2022 written a formal letter to Mark Scarr, who is now the interim Service Director Highways and Streetscene, copied to Colin Parr, Strategic Director Environment and Climate Change, about the very poor communication on this issue going back some months. A very brief response had been received but this had no relevance to the campaigns identified in the letter.
NOTED: Members noted the Deputy Clerk's report.
- Members considered further actions on this issue at this time.
RESOLVED: It was resolved that no further action would be taken until the Service Director Highways and Streetscene post had been filled.
Cllr T Dixon pointed out that the issues at this highway would be diminished in the winter months as usage decreased but that pressure on this issue from the Parish Council needed to be employed as spring and summer approached.

Campaign for a Safer Magdale

- As above, at the previous meeting of this Committee, the Deputy Clerk had reported on the poor communication from Kirklees Highways on this ongoing issue and campaign. Members heard that Mark Scarr had since replied saying, "Apologies for the delay in responding. The highway Safety have been inundated with road safety enquiries of late. I will ask them if they can look at your enquiry as a matter of urgency" but that no communication had been received on this issue at the time of the meeting. As above, the Deputy Clerk 31/01/2022 wrote a formal letter to Mark Scarr who is now the interim Service Direct Highways and Streetscene copied to Colin Parr, Strategic Director Environment and Climate Change, about the very poor communication on this issue. Only a brief response had been received at the time of the meeting.
NOTED: Members noted the Deputy Clerk's report.
- Members considered further actions on this issue at this time.
RESOLVED: It was resolved that no further action would be taken until the Service Director Highways and Streetscene post had been filled.

Holme Valley Parish Council

Hade Edge Road Intersection

NOTED: Members noted that the Committee Chair has been in contact with local residents and with Kirklees Highways about this campaign. She reported that her main contact in Hade Edge did not want a “soft option,” staged approach to developments at the Boshaw Trout road junction as proposed by Kirklees Highways and supported by the Parish Council. Without the support of Hade Edge people and little support from Holme Valley South Kirklees Councillors, this approach looked to have stalled. Cllr Blacka made Kirklees Highways aware of this. However, the Chair reported more positively that Mark Scarr from Kirklees Highways had since revisited the plan and contacted the three Holme Valley South Councillors about proposals. Cllr Blacka was hopeful regarding these developments.

Burnlee Road Closure

- Cllr Wilson reported on the longstanding road closure. Members thanked Cllr Wilson for his perseverance in highlighting this issue and championing the cause.
NOTED: Members noted the letter of 17th January 2022 from Farhad Khatibi/Ben Wright from the Structures team at Kirklees Highways regarding the closure. The Committee considered any further actions on this issue.
RESOLVED: The Deputy Clerk would thank Kirklees for their letter but insist that the necessary works to see through the re-opening of the road be progressed with due haste. Residents should not be waiting so long for a through-road to be reopened.

2122 193 Ramsden Road

- **NOTED:** The Committee noted that the Deputy Clerk had formally requested an update from Will Acornley, Head of Operational Services at Kirklees Council overseeing open spaces, on the progress of the Public Space Protection Order on the lanes and byways around Ramsden, Brownhill, Riding Wood and Yateholme reservoirs with a timescale for completion. The Committee further noted the report from Will Acornley that the reason the PSPO had not been implemented was due to estimated prohibitive costs of the project, - namely, £100,000+ for the gates.
- **RESOLVED:** It was resolved that the Deputy Clerk suggested to Kirklees that the Council review its design of the gates. It was understood that the proposed gates were very high-specification to hinder members of the public cutting through the gates with an angle grinder. But Members proposed that a simpler, cheaper design might be as effective such as that used by Erewash Council in a similar PSPO. Cllr Wilson will inquire about the gates used by Erewash. The Committee, again, thanked Cllr Wilson for his engagement on this issue.

Holme Valley Parish Council

2122 194 Feedback from Training

- The Committee Chair reported on having attended webinar training on Broadening Your Planning Knowledge. The Chair said she found the training useful and would précis the content for the Standing Committee. The Chair reported that the training had indicated that Parish Councils should take the initiative on design codes for their local areas.
- **NOTED:** Members noted the Chair's report.

2122 195 Footpath 6-month TTRO Closure Honley

- **NOTED:** Members noted a Parish Councillor's objection to the length of time of the Temporary Traffic Regulation Order (TTRO) to Public Right of Way HOL 31/40, Honley.
- Members considered whether to support this objection.
RESOLVED: Members voted to express concern about the duration of this footpath closure, and the Parish Council would ask for more details about the need for the closure.

2122 196 Wolfstones Footpath 60

- **NOTED:** Members noted that the public inquiry into the diversion of Holmfirth Footpath 60 at Wolfstones reopened on 28th January 2022 and that, at some point thereafter, a decision will be made by the Inspector.

2122 197 Publicising the work of Holme Valley Parish Council

- **RESOLVED:** It was resolved that the Deputy Clerk would post links to planning lists to the Parish Council Facebook page; shared to the Community pages. In particular, the Deputy Clerk would draw people's attention to the more controversial applications. The Parish Council would work on involving members of the public virtually in meetings via Zoom teleconferencing and in-person.
- **RESOLVED:** It was further resolved that articles and posts might concentrate on drawing out themes from the Neighbourhood Plan, - like landscape characteristics and sustainability.
- **RESOLVED:** It was resolved that the Parish Council would post or publicise its comments on some major or controversial developments.
- **RESOLVED:** It was resolved that the Committee would write an article for the Holme Valley Review on how the planning committee is using the Neighbourhood Development Plan in its work. Also, a short "Did you know...?" sketch-report would simply state, "Did you know that the Parish Council reviews all planning applications in the Holme Valley from Kirklees Council and the Peak District National Park Authority?"

Holme Valley Parish Council

A member suggested that it would be positive if Planning Committee Meetings reviewing large-scale planning developments were held in ward localities to encourage local engagement.

The meeting closed at 830pm

.....
Chairman

Holme Valley Parish Council

Planning applications lodged with Kirklees from **04 01 2022** to **01 02 2022** - **List 2122-10**. The following applications will be considered by Holme Valley Parish Council ahead of the Planning Committee meeting **07/02/2022**. Where appropriate, recommendations will be made to Kirklees Planning Services regarding whether or not they should be approved, but the final decisions will be taken by Kirklees Planning Services.

Local residents can email deputyclerk@holmevalleyparishcouncil.gov.uk to submit their views on applications or, better still, attend the meeting in person. Contact the deputy clerk if you want to attend.

Full details regarding deadline dates for comments and how to submit a comment can be obtained from the Kirklees' website: www.kirklees.gov.uk/planning

We have reports that the links to Planning Applications below may not work on some iOS devices. This is an iOS issue. If the links to the applications do not work, go to the [Kirklees Planning Portal](#) and search for applications there.

HVPC Reference:	2122/10/01
Application No:	2022/62/90033/W
Location:	Newlyn, Kirkroyds Lane, New Mill, Holmfirth, HD9 1LS
Ward/Councillors:	Fulstone – DF DH
Proposed Development:	Demolition of existing timber garage and erection of double garage for housing of domestic vehicles
OS Map Ref:	SE 415539409017
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90033
HVPC Comment:	Oppose. Inappropriate development due to height
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/10/02
Application No:	2022/62/90074/W
Location:	113, Upperthong Lane, Upperthong, Holmfirth, HD9 3UZ
Ward/Councillors:	Upperthong – DC AW
Proposed Development:	Erection of extensions and alterations
OS Map Ref:	SE 413186.8904408177.6521
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90074
HVPC Comment:	Support conditional on no loss of light to neighbour
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/10/03
Application No:	2021/60/94732/W
Location:	Land Adjacent, Glen View, New Mill Road, Holmfirth, HD9 7LN
Ward/Councillors:	Wooldale – JB PDv DG
Proposed Development:	Outline application for erection of residential development
OS Map Ref:	SE 414769.1856409212.1301
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2021/94732
HVPC Comment:	Support in principle but have concerns about the access. Applicant/developer should give more consideration to renewable energy such as solar power.
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/10/04
Application No:	2022/70/90028/W
Location:	adj 8, Well Hill, Honley, Holmfirth, HD9 6JF
Ward/Councillors:	Honley Central and East – PC BL SS
Proposed Development:	Variation of condition 2 (Plans) on previous permission no. 2021/93322 for Variation of condition 2 (Plans) on previous permission 2019/93994 for erection of detached dwelling (within a Conservation Area)
OS Map Ref:	SE 413623.7163411880.2356
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90028
HVPC Comment:	No observation. Defer to Kirklees Officers.
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/10/05
Application No:	2022/62/90054/W
Location:	Windsor Farm, Hill Top Bank, New Mill, Holmfirth, HD9 7DN
Ward/Councillors:	Fulstone – DF DH
Proposed Development:	Erection of extension to roof and associated alterations
OS Map Ref:	SE 416461.0519409587.3623
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90054
HVPC Comment:	Support
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/10/06
Application No:	2022/62/90118/W
Location:	Primo Casa, 14, Thirstin Road, Honley, Holmfirth, HD9 6JG
Ward/Councillors:	Honley Central and East – PC BL SS
Proposed Development:	Erection of part two storey side and first floor rear extensions and external alterations [within a Conservation Area]
OS Map Ref:	SE 413682.5634411922.1697
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90118
HVPC Comment:	No observation. Defer to Kirklees Officers.
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/10/07
Application No:	2022/62/90129/W
Location:	Carr Gate, Cold Hill Lane, New Mill, Holmfirth, HD9 7DN
Ward/Councillors:	Fulstone – DF DH
Proposed Development:	Erection of front stair lift and first floor front balcony with external alterations
OS Map Ref:	SE 416407.8734409464.6193
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90129
HVPC Comment:	Support
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/10/08
Application No:	2022/62/90143/W
Location:	37, Holmclose, Holmbridge, Holmfirth, HD9 2NJ
Ward/Councillors:	Upper Holme Valley – KB TB
Proposed Development:	Erection of single storey rear extension, first floor rear extension with terrace and front and rear dormer extensions
OS Map Ref:	SE 412084.7431406944.5553
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90143
HVPC Comment:	Oppose on the basis of over-development, - scale of extensions, insufficient parking
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/10/09
Application No:	2022/62/90160/W
Location:	The Old Tea House, Sheffield Road, Hepworth, Holmfirth, HD9 7TP
Ward/Councillors:	Hepworth – TD
Proposed Development:	Alterations to roof, erection of porch and exterior alterations
OS Map Ref:	SE 417407.7915406269.0312
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90160
HVPC Comment:	Support
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/10/10
Application No:	2022/62/90131/W
Location:	Bradshaw Edge Farm, Guinea Gate, Hade Edge, Holmfirth, HD9 2TB
Ward/Councillors:	Scholes – MBI RPD
Proposed Development:	Alterations to attached barn/store to extend living accommodation
OS Map Ref:	SE 415713.6032405079.715
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90131
HVPC Comment:	Support as long as heritage features are maintained
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/10/11
Application No:	2022/62/90132/W
Location:	Bradshaw Edge Farm, Guinea Gate, Hade Edge, Holmfirth, HD9 2TB
Ward/Councillors:	Scholes – MBI RPD
Proposed Development:	Erection of stables
OS Map Ref:	SE 415713.6032405079.715
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90132
HVPC Comment:	Support provided that the stable is retained for private use
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/10/12
Application No:	2022/62/90140/W
Location:	37, Upper Bank End Road, Holmfirth, HD9 1EP
Ward/Councillors:	Holmfirth Central – MBu RH
Proposed Development:	Erection of single storey extension to rear and side
OS Map Ref:	SE 414740.5535407541.0053
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90140
HVPC Comment:	Support
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/10/13
Application No:	2021/92206
Location:	Land Off, Woodhead Road, Honley, Holmfirth
Ward/Councillors:	Brockholes – MP
Proposed Development:	Erection of 137 homes with open space, landscaping and associated infrastructure
OS Map Ref:	SE 414768.9578 411137.6029
Link:	Planning application details Kirklees Council
HVPC Comment:	<p>Objection maintained on the basis of: 1) Over-intensification of the site causing concern regarding the additional impact on traffic, especially on Smithy Place Lane, and provision of local services. 2) Lack of pedestrian or cycle connectivity to Brockholes schools and shops shows a lack of community awareness. 3) Lack of a detailed plan regarding renewables and sustainability is a lost opportunity and must be rectified.</p> <p>The Parish Council previously commented in support of the project’s provision of affordable, 2-bed housing in the project. However, the Parish Council now notes that in this amended proposal the number of 3-bed homes has gone down significantly whilst the number of 4-bed homes has gone up significantly. The Parish Council does not support this revision and would prefer more affordable 2-bed and 3-bed homes as detailed in the Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development Plan. Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development “Made” Plan, December 2021 p101 Policy 6: Building Homes for the Future</p> <p>With regard to point 3) the Parish Council reiterates that a development of this size should be investigating options for extensive energy generation across the site, - solar power as a bare minimum but also looking into options for district heating. Applicant should reflect on the guidance from the “made” Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development Plan which states that, “Promoting Renewable Energy 1. In that part of the neighbourhood area where Kirklees Council is</p>

	the local planning authority, proposals for individual and community scale energy from hydro-electric, solar photovoltaic panels, biomass, anaerobic air digestion and ground source heating will be supported where they can be achieved without conflicting with the NDP policies to protect and enhance the landscape and built character of the Valley. 2. New developments should develop opportunities to deliver on site heat networks using renewable energy sources.” Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development “Made” Plan, December 2021 p152 Policy 12: Promoting Sustainability
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/10/14
Application No:	2022/62/90231/W
Location:	3, Greendale Court, Honley, Holmfirth, HD9 6JW
Ward/Councillors:	Honley Central and East – PC BL SS
Proposed Development:	Alterations to upper ground floor opening and formation of balcony (within a Conservation Area)
OS Map Ref:	SE 413592.3698412262.7854
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90231
HVPC Comment:	Support
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/10/15
Application No:	2021/62/94735/W
Location:	Ashleigh, Hill, Holmfirth, HD9 3BN
Ward/Councillors:	Upperthong – DC AW
Proposed Development:	Erection of single storey side/rear extension and associated alterations
OS Map Ref:	SE 413968.9926408418.1766
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2021/94735
HVPC Comment:	Support
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/10/16
Application No:	2022/62/90045/W
Location:	2, Southwood Avenue, Honley, Holmfirth, HD9 6QP
Ward/Councillors:	Honley Central and East – PC BL SS
Proposed Development:	Replacement of flat roof with pitched roof
OS Map Ref:	SE 414933.0552412180.9865
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90045
HVPC Comment:	Support
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/10/17
Application No:	2022/60/90186/W
Location:	adj, 6, Leyfield Bank, Wooldale, Holmfirth, HD9 1XU
Ward/Councillors:	Wooldale – JB PDv DG
Proposed Development:	Outline application for erection of residential development
OS Map Ref:	SE 414996.6255409228.3803
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90186
HVPC Comment:	Support
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/10/18
Application No:	2021/70/94712/W
Location:	Harroyd Farm, Dean Brook Road, Netherthong, Holmfirth, HD9 3TE
Ward/Councillors:	Netherthong – JD JR
Proposed Development:	Variation conditions 2 (plans) and 4 (materials) on previous permission 2017/92774 for demolition of existing agricultural barns/outbuildings and erection of dwelling, agricultural hay/feed barn and implement barn
OS Map Ref:	SE 414412410072
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2021/94712
HVPC Comment:	No observation. Defer to Kirklees Officers.
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/10/19
Application No:	2021/70/93541/W
Location:	land at, Westcroft, Honley, Holmfirth HD9 6JP
Ward/Councillors:	Honley Central and East – PC BL SS
Proposed Development:	Variation of Condition 1 (Plans) on previous permission 2020/91186 reserved matters application for erection of 20 dwellings pursuant to outline permission no. 2018/91198 for residential development (revised plan)
OS Map Ref:	SE 413525.6475411900.1211
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2021/93541
HVPC Comment:	No observation. Defer to Kirklees Officers.
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/10/20
Application No:	2022/62/90178/W
Location:	76, Dobb Top Road, Holmbridge, Holmfirth, HD9 2QP
Ward/Councillors:	Upper Holme Valley – KB TB
Proposed Development:	Erection of outbuilding
OS Map Ref:	SE 412088.0619406587.6259
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90178
HVPC Comment:	No observation. Insufficient detail.
Decision:	

Holme Valley Parish Council

Planning applications lodged with Kirklees from **01 02 2022** to **01 03 2022** - **List 2122-11**. The following applications will be considered by Holme Valley Parish Council ahead of the Planning Committee meeting **07/03/2022**. Where appropriate, recommendations will be made to Kirklees Planning Services regarding whether or not they should be approved, but the final decisions will be taken by Kirklees Planning Services.

Local residents can email deputyclerk@holmevalleyparishcouncil.gov.uk to submit their views on applications or attend the meeting in person. There may also be an opportunity to attend a meeting via Zoom and to comment in the Public Session at the start of the meeting. Contact the Deputy Clerk for a link.

Full details regarding deadline dates for comments and how to submit a comment can be obtained from the Kirklees' website: www.kirklees.gov.uk/planning

We have reports that the links to Planning Applications below may not work on some mobile devices. This is an operating system issue. If the links to the applications do not work, go to the [Kirklees Planning Portal](#) and search for applications there using the Application No.

HVPC Reference:	2122/11/01
Application No:	2022/62/90306/W
Proposed Development:	Erection of extensions and internal and external alterations
Location:	3, Bradshaw Close, Honley, Holmfirth, HD9 6EJ
OS Map Ref:	SE 413462.6082411178.2882
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90306
Ward/Councillors:	Honley South - JS
HVPC Comment:	
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/11/02
Application No:	2022/62/90267/W
Proposed Development:	Erection of first floor and two storey extension and exterior alterations (Within a Conservation Area)
Location:	24, Greenway, Honley, Holmfirth, HD9 6NQ
OS Map Ref:	SE 413529.0971412093.6536
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90267
Ward/Councillors:	Honley Central and East – PC BL SS
HVPC Comment:	
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/11/03
Application No:	2022/62/90277/W
Proposed Development:	Erection of two single storey side extensions
Location:	Gate Foot Farm, Gate Foot Lane, Shepley, Huddersfield, HD8 8AZ
OS Map Ref:	SE 418220.6678408490.063
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90277
Ward/Councillors:	Fulstone – DF DH
HVPC Comment:	
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/11/04
Application No:	2022/62/90063/W
Proposed Development:	Erection of single storey rear extension
Location:	Beech Garth, Field End Lane, Honley, Holmfirth, HD9 6NE
OS Map Ref:	SE 414131411613
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90063
Ward/Councillors:	Honley Central and East – PC BL SS
HVPC Comment:	
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/11/05
Application No:	2022/62/90094/W
Proposed Development:	Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of single storey rear extension
Location:	38, Burnlee Road, Holmfirth, HD9 2PS
OS Map Ref:	SE 413039.7767407745.528
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90094
Ward/Councillors:	Upperthong – DC AW
HVPC Comment:	
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/11/06
Application No:	2022/62/90279/W
Proposed Development:	Erection of front porch, formation of permeable hard standing to front garden, conversion of existing garage into living accommodation, raising rear deck level, and extend existing dropped kerb with external alterations
Location:	29, Spring Bank Croft, Holmfirth, HD9 2LW
OS Map Ref:	SE 412918.895407909.2653
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90279
Ward/Councillors:	Upperthong – DC AW
HVPC Comment:	
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/11/07
Application No:	2022/62/90346/W
Proposed Development:	Erection of single storey rear and first floor side extensions and rear dormer and external alterations
Location:	12, Edgemoor Road, Honley, Holmfirth, HD9 6HP
OS Map Ref:	SE 413248.9546411364.12
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90346
Ward/Councillors:	Honley West – SE CG
HVPC Comment:	
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/11/08
Application No:	2022/62/90072/W
Proposed Development:	Demolition of existing side extension and erection of single storey side extension and alterations to front door
Location:	8, West Moor View, Honley, Holmfirth, HD9 6HU
OS Map Ref:	SE 413332.5786411679.6948
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90072
Ward/Councillors:	Honley West – SE CG
HVPC Comment:	
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/11/09
Application No:	2022/62/90098/W
Proposed Development:	Erection of single storey rear extension
Location:	43, Holmebank Mews, Brockholes, Holmfirth, HD9 7EA
OS Map Ref:	SE 415069.457410929.0682
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90098
Ward/Councillors:	Brockholes - MP
HVPC Comment:	
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/11/10
Application No:	2022/62/90047/W
Proposed Development:	Erection of single storey rear extension and external alterations
Location:	58, River Holme View, Brockholes, Holmfirth, HD9 7BP
OS Map Ref:	SE 415200.4929410554.6033
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90047
Ward/Councillors:	Brockholes - MP
HVPC Comment:	
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/11/11
Application No:	2022/62/90393/W
Proposed Development:	Demolition of existing porch, sun room, and tennis court and erection of single storey porch extension and single storey rear extension with replacement of existing windows, alterations to existing openings, rendering existing elevations and vehicular entrance widened with new boundary wall erected
Location:	Carr Wood House, 23, Bellgreave Avenue, New Mill, Holmfirth, HD9 7DP
OS Map Ref:	SE 416895.8577408981.873
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90393
Ward/Councillors:	Fulstone – DF DH
HVPC Comment:	
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/11/12
Application No:	2022/62/90243/W
Proposed Development:	Engineering operations to regrade land and form terraced slope supported by stone gabions, formation of access steps with associated landscaping
Location:	Melton Ford, Park Side, Scholes, Holmfirth, HD9 1UF
OS Map Ref:	SE 416059407601
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90243
Ward/Councillors:	Scholes – MBI RPD
HVPC Comment:	
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/11/13
Application No:	2022/65/90441/W
Proposed Development:	Listed Building Consent for installation of replacement windows (within a Conservation Area)
Location:	12, Well Hill, Honley, Holmfirth, HD9 6JF
OS Map Ref:	SE 413644.9984411882.721
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90441
Ward/Councillors:	Honley Central and East – PC BL SS
HVPC Comment:	
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/11/14
Application No:	2022/62/90359/W
Proposed Development:	Erection of dwelling
Location:	Near Law Slack Farm, Penistone Road, Hepworth, Holmfirth, HD9 2TR
OS Map Ref:	SE 415966.4405405045.0634
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90359
Ward/Councillors:	Hepworth - TD
HVPC Comment:	
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/11/15
Application No:	2022/62/90352/W
Proposed Development:	Alteration of existing window to form double doors and formation of external sitting area with associated engineering works
Location:	2, Broadbent Croft, Honley, Holmfirth, HD9 6PN
OS Map Ref:	SE 414044.6142411854.9226
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90352
Ward/Councillors:	Honley Central and East – PC BL SS
HVPC Comment:	
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/11/16
Application No:	2022/44/90420/W
Proposed Development:	Discharge of conditions 2 (materials) and 4 (construction management) of previous reserved matters approval ref: 2020/91186 for erection of 20 dwellings pursuant to outline permission 2018/91198 for residential development
Location:	Land at, Westcroft, Honley, Holmfirth, HD9 3UL
OS Map Ref:	SE 413525.6475411900.1211
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90420
Ward/Councillors:	Netherthong – JD JR
HVPC Comment:	
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/11/17
Application No:	2022/44/90447/W
Proposed Development:	Discharge conditions 4, 6, 8, 12, 16 on previous permission 2015/93850 for demolition of intensive poultry farm buildings and redevelopment of site with 6 detached dwellings with associated landscaping including new paddock
Location:	New Dunsley Poultry Farm, Brow Lane, Holmfirth, HD9 2SW
OS Map Ref:	SE 413512.3654407174.3311
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90447
Ward/Councillors:	Upper Holme Valley – KB TB
HVPC Comment:	
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/11/18
Application No:	2022/62/90416/W
Proposed Development:	Demolition of existing rear extension and erection of single storey rear extension
Location:	9, Wheat Close, Holmbridge, Holmfirth, HD9 2QL
OS Map Ref:	SE 411595.1775406498.2219
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90416
Ward/Councillors:	Upper Holme Valley – KB TB
HVPC Comment:	
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/11/19
Application No:	2022/62/90518/W
Proposed Development:	Erection of one detached dwelling (within a Conservation Area)
Location:	Land adj, 64, Town End Road, Wooldale, Holmfirth, HD9 1XT
OS Map Ref:	SE 415064.564409100.9463
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90518
Ward/Councillors:	Wooldale – JB PD DG
HVPC Comment:	
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/11/20
Application No:	2021/62/93813/W
Proposed Development:	Demolition of existing funeral home and erection of new dwelling (class C3) with associated landscaping and decked terrace to rear (within a Conservation Area)
Location:	Edgeworth, Main Gate, Hepworth, Holmfirth, HD9 1TJ
OS Map Ref:	SE 416412.7393406634.5481
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2021/93813
Ward/Councillors:	Hepworth - TD
HVPC Comment:	
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/11/21
Application No:	2022/62/90463/W
Proposed Development:	Erection of half a storey lean-to extension over existing flat roof garage and single storey lean-to extension to rear with external alterations
Location:	East View, 264, Dunford Road, Holmfirth, HD9 2RR
OS Map Ref:	SE 414755.5068406888.6769
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90463
Ward/Councillors:	Holmfirth Central – MBu RH
HVPC Comment:	
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/11/22
Application No:	2022/62/90478/W
Proposed Development:	Removal of existing conservatory and erection of single storey rear extension
Location:	21, Mount View Road, Hepworth, Holmfirth, HD9 1JA
OS Map Ref:	SE 416459.1911406825.5502
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90478
Ward/Councillors:	Hepworth - TD
HVPC Comment:	
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/11/23
Application No:	2022/62/90564/W
Proposed Development:	Partial demolition of existing timber frame dwelling and erection of of new dwelling
Location:	The Dolphins, Upper Hagg Road, Thongsbridge, Holmfirth, HD9 6NH
OS Map Ref:	SE 414687.0656410680.9233
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90564
Ward/Councillors:	Netherthong – JD JR
HVPC Comment:	
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/11/24
Application No:	2022/62/90561/W
Proposed Development:	Erection of single storey rear and two storey side extensions, removal of existing outbuilding and associated works
Location:	Norina House, Scholes Moor Road, Scholes, Holmfirth, HD9 1SR
OS Map Ref:	
Link:	https://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90561
Ward/Councillors:	Scholes – MBI RPD
HVPC Comment:	
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/11/25
Application No:	2022/44/90546/W
Proposed Development:	Discharge of conditions 7 (internal roads), 8 (waste), 10 (electric vehicle charging), 13 (landscape maintenance), 19 (temporary waste arrangements) and 20 (low carbon energy technologies) of Reserved Matters approval 2020/91186 for erection of 20 dwellings pursuant to outline permission 2018/91198 for residential development
Location:	Land at, Westcroft, Honley, Holmfirth, HD9 6JP
OS Map Ref:	SE 413525.6475411900.1211
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90546
Ward/Councillors:	Honley Central and East – PC BL SS
HVPC Comment:	
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/11/26
Application No:	2022/62/90579/W
Proposed Development:	Erection of rear dormer extension
Location:	6, Edgemoor Road, Honley, Holmfirth, HD9 6HP
OS Map Ref:	
Link:	https://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90579
Ward/Councillors:	Honley West – SE CG
HVPC Comment:	
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/11/27
Application No:	2022/65/90653/W
Proposed Development:	Listed Building Consent to convert the existing window into french doors
Location:	1, Hill Street, Jackson Bridge, Holmfirth, HD9 1LZ
OS Map Ref:	SE 416349.1611407422.8871
Link:	http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90653
Ward/Councillors:	Scholes – MBI RPD
HVPC Comment:	
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/11/28
Application No:	2022/62/90511/W
Proposed Development:	Demolition of existing garage and erection of three storey side extension
Location:	1, Co-op Terrace, Sheffield Road, Hepworth, Holmfirth, HD9 7TX
OS Map Ref:	
Link:	https://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2022/90511
Ward/Councillors:	Hepworth - TD
HVPC Comment:	
Decision:	

Kirklees Planning Decisions for the period 01/02/2022 - 01/03/2022

No.	Location	Development	HVPC Comment	Kirklees Decision
94434	4, Butterley Lane, New Mill, Holmfirth, HD9 7EZ	Removal of conservatory, erection of extensions and external alterations	Support	Granted
94119	Fern Croft, Far End Lane, Honley, Holmfirth, HD9 6NS	Erection of side and rear extensions, bay window to front, detached garage and rebuild stone boundary wall	"made no observation"	Granted
93772	Ridgemoor, Magdale, Honley, Holmfirth, HD9 6RB	Erection of first floor extension above garage and formation of carport (Within a Conservation Area)	Support	Granted
93391	Mytholmbridge Farm, 36, Luke Lane, Thongsbridge, Holmfirth, HD9 7TB	Partial demolition of dwelling, erection of two-storey side and rear extensions, porch, link extension, detached garage and external alterations	Support	Refused
94626	14, Wickleden Gate, Scholes, Holmfirth, HD9 1QT	Removal of existing conservatory and erection of single storey rear extension	Support	Granted
92959	51, Magdale, Honley, Holmfirth, HD9 6LX	Erection of outbuilding for holiday let (within the curtilage of a Listed Building and Conservation Area)	Support subject to the provision of an extra parking space	Granted
93893	Delph Cottage, Long Ing Road, Hade Edge, Holmfirth, HD9 2JH	Erection of single storey extension	Support	Refused
92434	Lydgate Sunday School, Holmfirth Road, New Mill, Holmfirth, HD9 7LF	Change of use of former Sunday school class F(i)(f) to retail unit class E(a) and alterations to boundary wall and vehicular access	Support	Refused
94220	Holmfirth Police Station, Huddersfield Road, Thongsbridge, Holmfirth, HD9 3JL	Replacement of windows, doors, fascia boards and associated repair works	Support	Granted
94238	Dalveen, Woodhead Road, Holmfirth, HD9 2PX	Erection of first floor side extension, new side entrance and external alterations	Support	Granted
94373	Scholes Cricket Club, Chapelgate, Scholes, Holmfirth, HD9 1SX	Alterations to existing building, erection of single storey side extension and erection of detached garage/store to rear with photovoltaic panels to roof	In support, whereby the Parish Council would like to commend the applicant for its inclusion of sustainability measures to address climate change.	Granted

Kirklees Planning Decisions for the period 01/02/2022 - 01/03/2022

No.	Location	Development	HVPC Comment	Kirklees Decision
93928	Former Midlothian Garage, New Mill Road, Holmfirth, HD9 7LN	Variation of condition 1 (Plans) on previous permission 2018/91579 reserved matters application pursuant to outline application 2015/93824 for erection of 56 dwellings	<p style="color: red;">“No comments received”</p> <p>Kirklees received HVPC’s comment 08/11/22. The comment was:</p> <p style="color: red;">“Oppose the application for variation of conditions on the reduction in the number of three-bedroom properties; the Parish Council would also expect more detail from a project of this size on meeting sustainability outcomes and addressing the climate emergency. Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development Referendum Plan, August 2021 p152 Policy 12: Promoting Sustainability”</p>	Granted
93228	adj, 27, Town End Road, Wooldale, Holmfirth, HD9 1AH	Outline application for erection of residential development	Object on the grounds of highways safety and overdevelopment	Granted
94391	Land to the left of Brockholes lane, adj Brockholes Gun Club, Brockholes, Holmfirth, HD9 7BG	Prior notification for erection of agricultural building	<p>“No comments received”</p> <p>Kirklees received HVPC’s comment 12/01/22. The comment was:</p> <p>“No observation. Insufficient detail.”</p>	Granted

Kirklees Planning Decisions for the period 01/02/2022 - 01/03/2022

No.	Location	Development	HVPC Comment	Kirklees Decision
93591	Victoria Tower, Lumb Lane, Castle Hill, Almondbury, Huddersfield, HD4 6TA	Erection of restaurant/café/bar, six guest rooms, exhibition/interpretation room, WCs, terrace, car parking and ancillary accommodation	<p>Object</p> <p>“Concerns that the original listed building was lost through the actions of the applicant, because they wanted something bigger instead of extending. As soon as the old building was taken down this site reverted to green belt. Applicant should not have been allowed to demolish a listed building without consent. Object to current application on grounds that the proposed development is not in keeping as a new building in the green belt, adjacent to a listed building. This is also an archaeological site, where a Roman fort existed originally, so the new building is totally inappropriate. Members also have highways concerns regarding access/egress to site.”</p>	Granted
94610	52, Thirstin Road, Honley, Holmfirth, HD9 6JG	Erection of single storey side extension and rear dormer [within a Conservation Area]	Support	Granted
93351	Hooley House, 1, Concord Street, Honley, Holmfirth, HD9 6AE	Formation of decked area, erection of balustrades to boundaries to provide outdoor seating area (within a Conservation Area)	No observation. Defer to Kirklees Officers.	Granted
94453	4, Whinney Bank Cottages, Winney Bank Lane, Holmfirth, HD9 1US	Formation of doorway within existing window opening and new external stone steps (Listed Building)	No observation. Defer to Kirklees Officers.	Granted
94454	4, Whinney Bank Cottages, Winney Bank Lane, Holmfirth, HD9 1US	Listed Building Consent for formation of doorway within existing window opening and new external stone steps	No observation. Defer to Kirklees Officers.	Granted
94163	1, Lingwood Close, New Mill, Holmfirth, HD9 7NN	Erection of first floor extension and exterior alterations	In support subject to no overlooking	Granted

Kirklees Planning Decisions for the period 01/02/2022 - 01/03/2022

No.	Location	Development	HVPC Comment	Kirklees Decision
94587	10, White Wells Gardens, Scholes, Holmfirth, HD9 1TZ	Erection of single storey front extension	Support	Granted
94054	3, Marsh Gardens, Honley, Holmfirth, HD9 6AF	Variation of conditions 11 (solar panels) and 12 (bicycle storage) on previous permission 2019/93445 for demolition of existing bungalow and erection of 3 dwellings with gardens and parking	<p style="color: red;">“The Parish Council wants to reiterate that it opposes this proposal. Both conditions are important and should stand. The Parish Council wants to ensure that the Planning Officer addresses all representations received from members of the public in his report.”</p>	Granted
94419	26, Moorside Road, Honley, Holmfirth, HD9 6ER	Demolition of existing conservatory and utility, erection of single storey rear and side extensions and alterations to roof	Support	Granted
94708	8, Old Turnpike, Honley, Holmfirth, HD9 6PD	Erection of extensions and alterations	Withdrawn	Withdrawn



DATE

Dear Councillor,

Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP)

As you will be aware, following its positive result in the public referendum on 4th November, the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) was fully 'made' on 8 December 2021. This meant that its planning policies became formally recognised by Kirklees and the Peak District National Park and have to be considered by them when making future decisions on development in the Holme Valley. Whilst, during its development, the NDP was largely the responsibility of the Planning Committee, it now provides a structure for much of the work of the Parish Council as a whole.

Given its importance for the whole Council, the Planning Committee recognised that all councillors should have ready access to the NDP and agreed that printed copies should be made and distributed. Printed copies are already available for public review in Holmfirth and Honley Libraries as well as the HVPC office and it is of course available on our website:

https://www.holmevalleyparishcouncil.gov.uk/Neighbourhood_Plan_22997.aspx

It is important to be clear that the NDP provides an overview of our community's expectations against which initiatives - including building developments - in the Holme Valley should be considered. There has been some misconception: the NDP does not itself either propose or lead any specific developments or initiatives.

For the Planning Committee, the NDP provides an additional framework, alongside the Local Plan, against which local planning applications are considered. Kirklees Council planning officers are already citing the NDP in their reports on applications and our Committee is using it to strengthen and justify our responses.

Whilst the NDP is ultimately a planning policy document, through its development over 5 years, its scope, content and value goes beyond the consideration of specific planning applications. It highlights many wider issues which are the responsibility of the whole Council and other committees such as:

- Policy 7: Supporting economic activity
- Policy 9: Protecting and enhancing local community facilities
- Policy 11: Improving transport, accessibility and local community infrastructure

Alongside this, it does of course reinforce the importance of the Climate Emergency Action Plan through its environmental policies:

- Policy 12: Promoting sustainability
- Policy 13: Protecting Wildlife and securing biodiversity net gain

The NDP's appendix of wider actions captures a large number of issues and concerns which our community highlighted for our attention with some already being explored by our committees and many more to consider further and work through. It is probably going to take us all some time to become familiar with the NDP and its provisions, but I hope having your own personal copy to refer to will make this easier!

Best wishes,

.....
Cllr Rachel Hogley

.....
Cllr Mary Blacka

Planning applications lodged with the Peak District National Park Authority from 23 11 2021 to 01 03 2022 - List 2122-03PD. The following applications will be considered by Holme Valley Parish Council at the Planning Committee meeting **07/03/2022**. Where appropriate, recommendations will be made to the Peak District National Park Authority Planning Services regarding whether or not they should be supported, but the decisions will be taken by the Peak District National Park Authority Planning Services.

Local residents can email deputyclerk@holmevalleyparishcouncil.gov.uk to submit their views on applications or attend the meeting in person. There may also be an opportunity to attend a meeting via Zoom and to comment in the Public Session at the start of the meeting. Contact the Deputy Clerk for a link.

Full details regarding deadline dates for comments and how to submit a comment can be obtained from the PDNPA website: <http://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/planning/have-your-say/comment-on-an-application>

HVPC Reference:	2122/03PD/01
Application No:	NP/K/0222/0139
Proposed Development:	Internal & external alterations to dwelling including demolition of former blockwork dairy & erection of single storey extension.
Location:	41 The Village, Holme, Holmfirth
OS Map Ref:	
Link:	https://portal.peakdistrict.gov.uk/result/YToyOntzOjE0OiJPYmplY3RfVHlwZV9JRCl7czoxOjI3IjtzOjE2OiJPYmplY3RfUmVmZXJlbnNlIjtzOjE0OiJOUc9LLzAyMjlvMDEzOSI7fQ==
Ward/Councillors:	Upper Holme Valley – KB TB
HVPC Comment:	
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/03PD/02
Application No:	NP/K/0222/0239
Proposed Development:	Erection of two storey side extension and rear porch (within a conservation area)
Location:	2 Meal Hill Farm, Meal Hill Road, Holme
OS Map Ref:	
Link:	https://portal.peakdistrict.gov.uk/result/YToyOntzOjE0OiJPYmplY3RfVHlwZV9JRCl7czoxOjI3IjtzOjE2OiJPYmplY3RfUmVmZXJlbnNlIjtzOjE0OiJOUc9LLzAyMjlvMDIzOSI7fQ==
Ward/Councillors:	Upper Holme Valley – KB TB
HVPC Comment:	
Decision:	

HVPC Reference:	2122/03PD/03
Application No:	NP/K/0222/0240
Proposed Development:	Listed Building consent - Erection of two storey side extension and rear porch (within a conservation area)
Location:	2 Meal Hill Farm, Meal Hill Road, Holme
OS Map Ref:	
Link:	https://portal.peakdistrict.gov.uk/result/YToyOntzOjE0OiJPYmplY3RfVHlwZV9JRCl7czoxOjI3IjtzOjE2OiJPYmplY3RfUmVmZXJlbnNlIjtzOjE0OiJOUc9LLzAyMjlvMDI0MCI7fQ==
Ward/Councillors:	Upper Holme Valley – KB TB
HVPC Comment:	
Decision:	

Development Management Practice Note Policy DMH1: New affordable housing



1. Introduction

- 1.1. This practice note sets out how Development Management Policies (DMP) policy DMH1 should be applied when considering applications for **new houses by individuals¹ seeking to meet their own housing needs.**
- 1.2. The practice note focuses on this particular type of affordable housing as evidence demonstrates that individuals or 2 people forming a household together have consistently sought properties of the maximum size allowed by policy DMH1 (97m²), which is greater than the size of property permitted for their identified need.
- 1.3. DMP Para 6.48 states that the Authority will be flexible in its application of policy DMH1 for people addressing their own need. This practice note provides guidance on how to apply this flexibility in a consistent manner so that applicants are able to meet their identified need and the housing built is more likely to remain affordable in perpetuity, so addressing the long-term needs of the community in accordance with strategic policy and national guidance.
- 1.4. A report to Planning Committee on the 16th April 2021² set out the background to policy DMH1, the purpose of floorspace size thresholds and issues regarding the clarity and intent of policy and consequent effect on decision-making.
- 1.5. Recent planning Appeal decisions³ have supported the Authority's approach; that through policy DMH1 size of affordable housing is restricted to the applicant's current need. Inspectors' decisions have also referenced DMP Policy DMH7 which allows extensions to affordable dwellings should an applicant's circumstances change.
- 1.6. At Planning Committee (16th April 2021) members agreed to officer recommendations to hold a special meeting of the Local Plan Review Steering Group⁴ in order to discuss these issues and agree a pragmatic solution in advance of any changes to policy that could be brought about through the formal plan review. This was held on 3rd November 2021⁵ and this Practice Note sets out the agreed approach.

¹ For clarity 'individuals' is a term used to refer to the household as a whole.

² [Planning Committee 18 November 2005 Item 6.1 \(peakdistrict.gov.uk\)](https://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/planning-committee-18-november-2005-item-6.1)

³ NP/DDD/1020/0941 Appeal ref APP/M9496/W/21/3277640

NP/DDD/1220/1217 Appeal ref APP/M9496/W/21/3277313

NP/DDD/0221/0150 Appeal ref APP/M9496/W/21/3275813

⁴ Members attending the meeting were Patrick Brady, Janet Haddock-Fraser, Robert Helliwell, Ken Smith and Yvonne Witter.

⁵ Minutes of this meeting are available on request.

2. Background

2.1. The National Parks Vision and Circular (2010)⁶ acknowledge the need for affordable housing in National Parks. Paragraph 79 of the Circular states:

'The Government expects the Authorities to maintain a focus on affordable housing and to work with local authorities and other agencies to ensure that the needs of local communities in the Parks are met and that affordable housing remains so in the longer term (our emphasis).'

2.2. The National Planning Policy Framework (2021)⁷, also acknowledges the need for affordable housing in rural areas. Para 78, states:

*'Local planning authorities should support opportunities to bring forward rural exception sites that will provide affordable housing to meet **identified local needs** (our emphasis).'*

2.3. In accordance with national guidance, Core Strategy Policy HC1 makes provision for new housing that addresses eligible local need and remains affordable. Restricting size and occupancy are the planning tools that help properties to remain affordable in perpetuity. DMP policy DMH1 restricts size to the identified need of the applicant and policy DMH2 restricts occupancy to those who have lived in the National Park for 10 years.

2.4. The size of affordable housing is controlled in line with the applicants housing need. Over time this creates a stock of homes that are more affordable and therefore more likely to meet a community's needs, as explained in DMP para 6.45. Some flexibility towards this is set out in paragraph 6.48 of the DMP, which states that where individuals are building affordable housing to meet their own need,

'greater flexibility will be afforded in terms of the size requirement up to the maximum of 97m² in accordance with policy DMH1'.

2.5. The purpose of the policy is not to predict the future need of the applicant, but to address their current need. DMP policy DMH7 allows for extensions to a property to cater for changes in circumstances.

3. Implementation of Policy DMH1

Number of bed spaces	Maximum Gross Internal Floor Area (m ²)
One person	39
Two persons	58
Three persons	70
Four persons	84
Five persons	97

⁶ National Parks Circular (publishing.service.gov.uk)

⁷ National Planning Policy Framework (publishing.service.gov.uk)

- 3.1. DMP policy DMH1 requires any new build housing to be within the following size thresholds⁸:
- 3.2. To ensure consistency in applying policy DMH1, and to avoid compromising its purpose and intent, increased size thresholds can be applied in the circumstances set out in para 3.3 below.
- 3.3. In all situations, the development shall address eligible local need in accordance with Core Strategy policy HC1 and DMP policy DMH2.
 - Properties for individual people will continue to be subject to a maximum allowance of 39m². In cases where flexibility is required based on personal circumstances, or in locations where for reasons relating to valued landscape character or the style and traditions of the locality, and a 2-storey house is most appropriate, individuals can apply for homes up to a maximum of 58m².
 - Couples or two people forming a household together can apply for homes up to 70m².
 - Families or people forming a household together of 3 or more, can apply for homes up to 97m².
- 3.4. DMP para 6.52 addresses the circumstances in which a property exceeding 97m² may be justified.
- 3.5. The flexibility in space standards provided in para 3.3 ensures new affordable housing reflects what is needed in the locality in accordance with DMP para 6.45, the National Parks Vision and Circular and the NPPF as set out in Section 2 above.

⁸ These size thresholds are based on [Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/362812/Technical_housing_standards_-_nationally_described_space_standard.pdf)



Subject: Affordable homes floor areas
From: Peak Park Parishes Forum <secpppf@gmail.com>
Date: 15/02/2022, 23:14
To: Peak Park Parishes Forum <secpppf@gmail.com>
BCC: admin@holmevalleyparishcouncil.gov.uk

Dear member Parish

At PDNPA's Planning Committee last week, there was a discussion around the attached document. It might (or might not) be argued that the document's content is unreasonable from the following perspective.

The way it appears to be intended to apply the policy is that if, say, a single person applies for consent to build an affordable family home, he/she will be turned down on the grounds that this is a bigger home than is needed. But within a couple of years, the applicant, while putting down roots in the community, may find themselves in a relationship, maybe with children on the way, in which case it would then seem short-sighted (but now too late to rectify) to have restricted him/her to building only a single person's home, which will now be too small..

At its meeting this week, the PPPF Management Committee debated whether to challenge PDNPA about this. It was decided to seek Parish views first. So, does your Parish regard the Authority's policy on this specific point as reasonable and sensible, or unreasonable and in need of being overturned? We'd appreciate your views please - many thanks.

Peter Leppard

Secretary, Peak Park Parishes Forum

— Attachments: —

Appendix1.pdf

1.6 MB

Subject: Ongoing closure of Burnlee Road, Holmfirth at its junction with Woodhead Road

From: Deputy Clerk <deputyclerk@holmevalleyparishcouncil.gov.uk>

Date: 01/03/2022, 18:19

To: Mark Scarr <mark.scarr@kirklees.gov.uk>

CC: ben.wright@kirklees.gov.uk, farhad.khatibi@kirklees.gov.uk, Cllr Donald Firth <cllrdonaldfirth@holmevalleyparishcouncil.gov.uk>, Cllr Paul Davies <cllrpauldavies@holmevalleyparishcouncil.gov.uk>, Cllr Nigel Patrick <nigel.patrick@kirklees.gov.uk>, Cllr Mary Blacka <cllrmaryblacka@holmevalleyparishcouncil.gov.uk>, Cllr Andy Wilson <cllrandywilson@holmevalleyparishcouncil.gov.uk>

Dear Mark

On behalf of the Parish Council, I would like to express Members' thanks for the explicatory letter from the Highways Structure team regarding the closure of Burnlee Road. The Parish Council does understand the complexity of the situation.

However, the Parish Council would like to remind Kirklees Councillors and Officers that this road has been closed now for over a year. Over a year. Whilst Burnlee Road could not by any stretch be considered a main road, it is, - or was, - nevertheless a well-used throughroad to a main road. As you can imagine, local people are confused by the length of time this is taking, and Parish Councillors are struggling to make sense of the inaction for them. Your letter does at least help with that.

But, plainly put, local people should simply not be waiting so long for an access road to Woodhead Road to be reopened. A year is a ridiculous length of time for Burnlee residents to be looking at a pile of rubble blocking their thoroughfare. We understand that other parties are to blame. But, please, do whatever the Council must do to get this road re-opened as quickly as possible.

Kind regards,

--

Rich McGill

Deputy Clerk and Responsible Finance Officer

Holme Valley Parish Council
Holmfirth Civic Hall
Huddersfield Road
Holmfirth HD9 3AS

Tel: 01484 687460

[Email: deputyclerk@holmevalleyparishcouncil.gov.uk](mailto:deputyclerk@holmevalleyparishcouncil.gov.uk)

18th February 2022



To: Will Acornley
Head of Operational Services, Highways and Streetscene

Dear Will

Re Yateholme area PSPO Number 1 of 2021

Thank you for your reply to the Parish Council about the prohibitively expensive cost of the gates currently proposed for the Yateholme area Public Space Protection Order (PSPO).

The Parish Council has asked me to make some further inquiries of you and at the same time to offer some potential solutions based on our own investigations.

One of our Councillors, Cllr Andy Wilson, has been in touch with Katherine Thornhill, Community Safety Officer at Erewash Borough Council about their rollout of a similar PSPO. This is on a route called Brackley Gate. This lane was experiencing comparable problems of off-roading and other vehicular anti-social behaviour to that experienced in the Upper Holme Valley.

At that point though, the situations of the respective PSPOs diverge.

Firstly, Erewash has fully implemented their PSPO. The consultation on that PSPO started on January 3rd 2021. The PSPO was in place by August 27th 2021. This is very different to the Yateholme experience. Cllr Wilson's discussions with Katherine Thornhill and, perhaps more importantly, with residents reassures him that their scheme is effective in managing the issues of anti-social behaviour.

Secondly, the cost of the scheme is vastly less. In Erewash Borough Council's report on the Brackley Gate PSPO, section 4.1 reads:

Morley Parish Council [in Derbyshire] have agreed to be responsible for applying for funding to cover the full cost of buying the gates which may be in the region of £6,000. Erewash Borough Council would take on future responsibility for their general maintenance which, it is anticipated, can be incorporated within existing budgets.

A £6,000 cost is considerably less than a six-figure cost.

With that in mind, the Parish Council would like to ask:

- What is the breakdown of the “six-figure sum” for the proposed Yateholme gates?
- What “other options” are being considered?
- What is the timescale for a conclusive solution to the persistent anti-social behaviour on the Yateholme routes?

People of the Upper Holme Valley want to remind Kirklees Directors and Officers that vehicular anti-social behaviour is exhibited on a daily and weekly basis around Yateholme. Furthermore, the cost of the necessary road repairs to the lanes and byways must be growing at an alarming rate. The problems are not going away, and inactivity is only making things worse.

The Parish Council hopes that Kirklees Council can learn from the Erewash experience. We have attached the Erewash Borough Council “Report of the Director of Community Services to the Council Executive” and would urge Kirklees Officers to study this and reflect on it. Katherine Thornhill has said she is very happy to speak with Officers about Erewash’s experience and to assist in any way she can in the procurement of gates at an affordable cost.

Additionally, we have attached photos of the gates which are now installed. These were tailor-made for this application by a local fabrication company. Details of course are available if requested.

The Parish Council looks forward to a prompt reply with answers to its three questions above, and a speedy and effective application of the Yateholme Public Space Protection Order.

Kind regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Rich McGill', written in a cursive style.

Rich McGill

Responsible Finance Officer and Deputy Clerk of Holme Valley Parish Council

EREWASH BOROUGH COUNCIL

Report of the Director of Community Services to the
Council Executive

24 February 2021

Public Spaces Protection Order

1 Purpose of report

- 1.1 To seek the support from the Council Executive for a Public Spaces Protection Order under the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014, to support tackling nuisance behaviour from motorised vehicles on Brackley Gate, Morley/Moor Lane, Little Eaton.

2 Recommendations

- (a) That the Council Executive authorises the making of a Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) to install gates at either end which are closed:
- (i) at all times (on all days through the week); or
 - (ii) part-time (closed from approximately 12.00 noon on Friday until approximately 7.00 am on Monday).
- (b) To approve the amount of the Fixed Penalty Notice (FPN) for offences of the Order under section 63 or 67 of the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 as set out in paragraph 3.30.

3 Information, issues and options

- 3.1 The council has been dealing with a long-standing anti-social behaviour (ASB) complaint regarding a lane known as Brackley Gate at the Morley end, which runs into Moor Lane at the Little Eaton end (as shown in Appendix 1).
- 3.2 The area is very rural and green, with a limited number of landowners bordering the lane; two residential properties on the north side, and Breadsall Priory Hotel and Golf Course, and Drum Hill Scout Campsite on the south side. There is also Severn Trent Plant Works at the Morley end and a footpath from the lane over Breadsall Priory land close to the boundary with Drum Hill land. The private land bordering the area is reasonably well defined from the lane, with either 'Private land, keep off' signage, or with stone walling along some of the land. The area is very natural, with a wide variety of birds and animals reported in the vicinity including deer. Local residents note that it has been and remains a popular area enjoyed by many for leisure activities including walking, dog walking, running, cycling and horse riding due to its natural habitat.

- 3.3 Brackley Gate is recorded as a publicly maintainable 'Non-Classified Highway' by the Highways Authority, Derbyshire County Council. This status does not precisely define what public rights exist over the route, including vehicle access. However the County Council is currently processing a claim to modify the Definitive Map and Statement (the Definitive Map), under the provisions of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, by adding Brackley Gate as a Byway Open to All Traffic (BOAT). If the evidence shows that public motorised vehicular rights exist then the route will be added to the Definitive Map as a BOAT. If not, it is likely that the route will be added to the Definitive Map with a status that represents the discovered public rights i.e. Restricted Byway, Public Bridleway or Public Footpath. At this time, the County Council is unable to provide a timescale for this to be determined and any public rights, owing to the current pandemic and a significant number of similar applications currently being processed. Full details of the application are available on the County Council website (derbyshire.gov.uk).
- 3.4 The surface of the lane is composed of hardcore, but is not tarmac beyond the last residential property's driveway at either end of the lane. Some minor work was undertaken to the road surface in August 2019 with additional hardcore added, following consideration of major maintenance work on Breadsall Priory land requiring lorry access. Up until this point, the road surface was very 'green' with little defined surface, uneven with large pot holes, muddy and unsuitable for most cars. Following the work in 2019, the lane has been easier for vehicles to use, however it is gradually deteriorating again with use and weather conditions.
- 3.5 Informal feedback from local residents has reported that very few people use the lane as a through route. Residents who live on the immediate roads surrounding the lane already find alternative routes, and report that this is as a result of the lane surface being unsuitable for cars and also the concerns about ASB in the area. Information was also provided to the council identifying the alternative routes that most local residents use (shown in Appendix 2). The alternative routes are maintained roads and locally are not considered to be an inconvenience or a major detour to the majority of users.
- 3.6 The ASB reported pre-dates 2016, with both Morley and Little Eaton Parish Councils receiving a significant amount of evidence and information (emails and photographs) from local residents experiencing a range of persistent ASB in the area. Along with reporting these to appropriate organisations, the incidents have been collated by one of the Neighbourhood Watch Co-ordinators/member of Morley Parish Council. The information shows a variety of problems occurring in the area including:
- ASB from a variety of vehicles including 4x4s, motorbikes, scrambler bikes and quad bikes, either behaving anti-socially on the lane by driving inconsiderately, revving engines inappropriately and doing spins on the lane, or accessing the private land either side from the lane to drive through the woodland;
 - ASB from mountain bikers using the private land either side of the lane for trails;

- Fly-tipping from vehicles onto the private land; and
- Other incidents including criminal damage to signage, walls and fencing, air rifles being used in the area and theft of wood from the woodland.

3.7 More recently, the evidence shows that from January to November 2019, 61 incidents were logged, occurring on 55 separate days. 42 incidents (69%) occurred over weekends from Friday to Sunday, at varying times during the day and/or evening. The other 19 incidents were spread out over the weekdays, but almost half (9) occurred on a Wednesday. The incidents reported included:

- 23 involving 4x4s or vehicles witnessed being driven anti-socially on the lane, private land or the footpath, or evidence of the behaviour;
- 5 reporting skid marks or tyre tracks on the lane or private land showing vehicles being used anti-socially in the area;
- 3 involving quad bikes being driven anti-socially on the lane, private land or on the footpath;
- 15 including motorbikes/scrambler bikes being driven anti-socially on the lane, private land or the footpath, or heard in the area;
- 2 incidents of mountain bikes being used on the private land (not all incidents logged); and
- Other incidents such as the theft of wood; 2 incidents of air rifles being used in the woodland; and alleged drug dealing or inappropriate activities in vehicles.

3.8 Incidents were not recorded from the middle of November to early January 2020 as the individual co-ordinating the log felt they needed a break from the situation.

3.9 There were similar levels of incidents reported during 2020, with 121 incidents recorded on 85 separate days. 59% of incidents were logged as occurring from Friday to Sunday. Incidents were also logged on each day of the week and at least 10 incidents each day over the year. The COVID-19 pandemic will have had an impact on the number of people using the lane and changed behaviours, for example road use reduced as a result of the ban on travel unless on essential business and not all incidents witnessed were logged by residents during 2020. The type of incidents reported included:

- 37 involving 4x4s or vehicles witnessed being driven anti-socially on the lane, private land or the footpath, or evidence of the behaviour;
- 4 involving quad bikes being driven anti-socially on the lane, private land or the footpath;
- 31 including motorbikes/scrambler bikes being driven anti-socially on the lane, private land or the footpath;
- 10 fly-tipping incidents on public or private land in the area;

- Numerous reports of litter left on the lane and the private land;
- 5 involving people riding mountain bikes on private land (not all incidents were logged); and
- There were other incidents reported including alleged drug dealing, drug use or inappropriate activities in vehicles. There was also criminal damage reported to walls and signage.

3.10 Considering the types of incidents noted, it is clear that the majority have a common theme of behaviour being perpetrated either on the lane itself, or using the lane to access the private land either side. It is also clear that this behaviour causes significant damage to the area.

3.11 The impact of this ongoing ASB has been consistently reported by local residents as:

- detrimental to their enjoyment of their properties from the noise and revving from the motorised vehicles being used in an anti-social manner, including during evenings and overnight;
- detrimental to their enjoyment of the local area for leisure activities due to the speed of vehicles and inappropriate use of the lane and local area;
- a reduction in the use of the local area for leisure activities due to the behaviour witnessed and experienced;
- significant and extensive damage to the natural habitat in the area and disturbance of wildlife;
- significant cost to clear the fly-tipping from private land, at landowners expense; and
- damage to signs, stone walls and fencing.

3.12 It is clear from the evidence provided that much of the behaviour being perpetrated can be classed as ASB and detrimental, however, not all of the reported incidents can be considered as a 'nuisance', in particular the incidents reported around mountain bikers using the area. It is acknowledged that whilst this behaviour may be an annoyance, this would not at this stage be something that could be taken forward and dealt with as ASB.

Solutions considered

3.13 When looking at a PSPO and in dealing with ASB, the legislation asks that the council considers all options. A range of solutions have been identified and tried in this case over a number of years but have been unsuccessful in tackling the ASB. These have included:

(a) Taking no further action

Doing nothing was not considered to be an adequate option as it is clear that the residents are experiencing ASB and that it is having a detrimental effect on the quality of their life and the local area. The

council has a legal duty to investigate anti-social behaviour and to take action in partnership.

(b) Increased/clear signage in the area

Issues may be resolved if the individuals perpetrating the behaviour know that they are on private land. Clear signage has been in place throughout the duration of the issues being witnessed, letting people know they are trespassing on private land. This has not stopped the ASB or resolved the situation.

(c) Identifying perpetrators of ASB

Residents and Morley Parish Council did contact Derbyshire Police when the ASB first started and it was passed to the local Safer Neighbourhood Team who then included this as a Priority Profile. This involved some additional patrols and attention from patrol vehicles in the area, as well as continued contact with residents and responding to reported incidents.

Derbyshire Police note that it is an ongoing, operational challenge to actually witness and evidence the behaviour as it occurs, and also to identify perpetrators due to the lane's geography and due to the complexity of the land ownership. The lane is accessible by vehicles and the vast areas of private land are not fenced off. It is clear from photographs of damage that the lane is used to access the private land, however unauthorised use such as this is a civil matter of trespass and therefore the responsibility of the owners to effectively secure their land and take appropriate action. In addition, road legal vehicles e.g. 4x4s, or motorbikes using the lane, but not witnessed behaving anti-socially are committing no offence.

Police continue to respond to incidents reported including trying to identify and then take enforcement action against perpetrators, however the land ownership and ability for the public to access the lane with vehicles continues to hamper actions. Operationally this type of ASB is notoriously difficult and can be high risk for officer safety when on foot and trying to talk or apprehend individuals on motorised vehicles. This can often require more specialist teams who are in high demand.

(d) Identify perpetrators through CCTV

Consideration has been given to the use of CCTV in the area, however this is a very costly measure, but also one that is felt would not provide a solution to the behaviour being perpetrated. It would not be possible to cover the entire area and therefore would only place particular vehicles driving down the lane, which is not an offence. Identification of individuals would still be a problem which the use of CCTV would not solve.

(e) Restrict access to the privately owned land

A significant proportion of the incidents involve the lane being used to access the private land, particularly Breadsall Priory's banked woodland. The council has contacted the landowners to suggest that they completely fence off their land to stop trespassing. However, this option was considered by the owners to be cost prohibitive and officers also believe would not be in keeping with the natural habitat. This is a beautiful open wooded area enjoyed by many, fencing it down both sides would significantly change this natural look and would also involve removing some of the natural habitat. In 2019 Breadsall Priory received a quotation of over £100,000 to install metal fencing to secure the woodland, which extends to over 30 square metres. It is also felt that this option might displace the anti-social use of other areas of the lane itself unless all the private land was fenced.

(f) Restrict the behaviour by use of a PSPO

The Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 (the 2014 Act) introduced several new tools and powers, including PSPOs, for use by councils and their partners to address anti-social behaviour (ASB) in their local areas. These tools, which replaced and streamlined a number of previous measures (including Gating Orders), were brought in as part of a Government commitment to put victims at the centre of approaches to tackling ASB, focussing on the impact behaviour can have on both communities and individuals.

The Act gives councils the authority to draft and implement PSPOs in response to the particular issues affecting their communities, provided the local authority is satisfied on reasonable grounds that certain criteria and legal tests have been met. They can be used to prohibit specified activities, and/or require certain things to be done by people engaged in particular activities. This concerns the nature of the ASB, requiring that:

- Activities that have taken place have had a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality, or it is likely that activities will take place and that they will have a detrimental effect.
- The effect or likely effect of these activities:
 - is, or is likely to be, persistent or continuing in nature;
 - is, or is likely to be, unreasonable;
 - justifies the restrictions being imposed.

Consideration was given to seek a PSPO to restrict access of the lane by motorised vehicles by way of a notice only i.e. not closing (gating) the lane. However, it was felt that trying to restrict the behaviour in this manner would not successfully deal with the issues being reported for a number of reasons:

- The behaviour is continuing, despite it already being illegal and inappropriate in the area. Signage is already up that states that the land is private property and yet the perpetrators have little regard for this and still commit ASB.
- The issues around identifying and catching the individuals committing the ASB as it happens are problematic as stated earlier in the report. It creates quite a high risk situation for officers on foot to stop and challenge individuals using motorised vehicles, and it is likely that it would require specialist police teams to support which would be limited due to competing demand and more serious issues.

(g) Restrict vehicle access to the lane via use of a PSPO (gating)

It is clear from the evidence base that the majority of ASB involves vehicles using the lane itself or to gain access to the private land in an anti-social manner; therefore restricting access to the lane could be a viable option. In addition, discussions with the County Council identified that only access to those groups or users of the lane/land behaving anti-socially should be restricted and that the council must maintain access for pedestrians, pedal cyclists and horse riders i.e. those other users not undertaking ASB.

Restricting vehicle access to publicly available land in this way can either be achieved through a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) or through a Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) authorising gates to be installed at both ends of the lane.

Derbyshire County Council (DCC) have considered the use of a permanent TRO to restrict legal access to the lane (not physical access), however, the County Council do not feel that this is a viable option at this time, primarily due to competing demand for resources across the county area and having to prioritise consideration of TROs. DCC also felt that it would be extremely challenging to enforce a TRO, resulting in a less than adequate solution.

Officers from both the County Council and Erewash Borough Council concluded that using a PSPO is a preferable and more appropriate tool compared to a TRO for a number of reasons; PSPOs are time-limited which will facilitate changes needed some time in the future, the County Council are unable to commit resources to introduce a TRO and enforcement of a TRO would be more problematic.

- 3.14 After full consideration of all the above, it was felt that the best option was to commence actions to consider restricting access to the lane through the use of gates.

PSPO consultation

3.15 Since this matter was first brought to the council's attention, informal consultation has been ongoing with local residents. This was primarily co-ordinated through representatives of Neighbourhood Watch and Morley Parish Council. The Parish Council undertook a short consultation exercise in August/September 2020 to seek information on ASB, ascertain the support for potential action, and seek views on gating off the lane (permitting access only for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders). 37 responses were received and the results showed that:

- 89% of respondents (33) had witnessed ASB in the area in the past 12 months with a significant number reporting issues with motorised vehicles;
- 90% of respondents (35) had seen evidence of ASB including damage to the woodland and tracks;
- 64% of respondents (29) said that this affected where they exercised locally;
- 42% of respondents (22) noted that they were not concerned about their safety when walking down the lane during the day, but 72% (31) did note that they would be concerned in the evening or at night due to the vehicles using the area; and
- 4% of respondents (3) noted that they objected to the lane being closed to motorised vehicles.

3.16 In addition, as required by the legislation, interested parties including businesses and residents who have land that borders the lane were consulted on the proposals. All respondents were in favour of restricting access, but stated that they require continuing vehicular access for example to undertake maintenance on their land.

3.17 The legislation also sets out requirements for formal consultation and communication before an Order is introduced, once it is implemented and where it is extended, varied or discharged. The PSPO guidance defines a requirement for public consultation on proposed PSPOs with a range of statutory consultees, including owners and occupiers of land where reasonably practicable. There are further requirements when considering restricting access to a right of access including the effect on owners of property adjacent to the highway, other people in the locality and whether a reasonable alternative route is available. Statutory consultees include the police, Police and Crime Commissioner and the County Council (where they are the Highway Authority).

In order to satisfy the legal requirements, an online survey was undertaken by the council to collect the views of residents, users of the space and partners. The survey was open for six weeks from 17 November 2020 until 3 January 2021, and received 114 responses. A copy of the survey can be found at

Appendix 3, along with details of the two alternative routes for users of the lane as a through route.

- 3.18 The survey was promoted through the council's social media platforms, on the council's website, through signage in the local area and an invitation sent personally to:
- the local residents acting as co-ordinators;
 - Derbyshire Police;
 - Derbyshire County Council;
 - Amber Valley Borough Council;
 - Local Parish Councils – Morley and Little Eaton;
 - Derbyshire's Police and Crime Commissioner; and
 - local land owners bordering the area proposed to be restricted including Drum Hill Scout Camp, Breadsall Priory Hotel and Golf Course, Severn Trent and residential properties.
- 3.19 Overall the consultation feedback was in favour of the PSPO to gate the lane, with some 83% of respondents stating that they agreed with the proposal and 71% of respondents did not feel that there were any other options available. 84% reported that closing the lane would not have a detrimental impact on them or their household. Those who disagreed with the proposal felt that the issues caused by mountain bikers would not be addressed, or expressed that they wished to continue using the lane legitimately for vehicular access. There were also comments regarding the responsibilities of landowners; suggestions on how to evidence offenders; and some respondents who wished to continue to use the area for mountain biking.
- 3.20 As outlined in paragraph 3.5, informal feedback from local residents and the formal consultation suggests that most do not use the lane as a through-route as it was completely unsuitable for vehicles until mid-2019 when some work to the road surface was undertaken. It is acknowledged that the alternative routes identified are longer, however the majority of respondents did not consider this to be too much of an inconvenience, mainly due to the fact that they already regularly use them.
- 3.21 The council also received representation from the Green Lane Association (GLASS) representing 4x4 owners, and the Trail Riders Fellowship (TRF). Both organisations represent individuals who want to be able to use 'green, local lanes' like Brackley Gate/Moor Lane for their enjoyment, their members signing up to a code of conduct requiring them to respect the natural habitat of areas they use.
- 3.22 It is unclear how much GLASS and TRF members use this area, but it is believed that it is unlikely that their members are the ones causing the anti-social behaviour. Both organisations were contacted and they asked that the council should permit their members to have the code/key to any gate erected

to allow vehicular access. The Highways Authority (Derbyshire County Council) (DCC) have informed us that the council (EBC) does not have the authority to sanction any vehicle access over this route.

- 3.23 There is some uncertainty by DCC as to the classification of the lane. In England and Wales, a byway open to all traffic (BOAT) is a highway over which the public have a [right of way](#) for vehicular and all other kinds of traffic but which is used by the public mainly for the purposes for which footpaths and [bridleways](#) are used (i.e. walking, cycling or horse riding (United Kingdom [Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984](#), section 15(9)(c), as amended by Road Traffic (Temporary Restrictions) Act 1991. The council cannot sanction vehicle access to the lane until the County Council have concluded their investigations, however it can look to restrict access (and not grant access) under its duty to tackle ASB in the area. When the determination of public access is concluded through the BOAT application, the council will take advice in consultation with the County Council to assess the validity of the PSPO. It would be inappropriate at this time to allow any concession within the proposed PSPO to allow any motorised vehicle user groups to access the lane even on application as this may be tantamount to encouraging an illegal activity if motorised vehicular rights are not proven to exist.
- 3.24 In summary, when considering all of the available evidence, the consultation results, the persistent and detrimental impact on local residents and users of the area, and the options considered to stop the behaviour, it is clear that this case meets the legislative tests and requirements for consideration of a PSPO. A draft example of such an Order can be found at Appendix 4.

Designs of gates

- 3.25 In looking to restrict access, a number of different designs for the gates have been considered by officers resulting in the proposal to create a bespoke gate for each end of the lane. At the Morley end, the land is on a significant slope, but is quite wide. The proposed barrier would incorporate a horse stile at the side and two swing gates with an integrated 'K' barrier in the middle. The swing gates would be wide enough to get emergency services or utility companies through, and secured into the ground when closed to reduce possible damage through excessive force and would be locked with a coded or key lock provided to those local residents/businesses etc who are exempt under the PSPO. This part of the lane also provides natural barriers either side which limit easy access by unauthorised vehicles
- 3.26 At the Little Eaton end, the lane is a much flatter, and narrower. The gate would be a horse hop swing gate, designed to enable emergency services and other approved vehicles to pass. It would be locked, with a pedestrian 'K' barrier to one side. Again, natural barriers either side restrict east access to by-pass the gate.
- 3.27 As mentioned above, the design of both gates enable access to be maintained by those who need it and conform to required standards, in line with guidance from the British Horse Society and from specialist officers from

the County Council. The positioning of the gates will also enable access to driveways of existing residential properties with driveways.

- 3.28 The Home Office's statutory guidance reiterates that PSPOs should be used responsibly and proportionately, only in response to issues that cause anti-social behaviour, and only where necessary to protect the public. In determining the best way to manage the ASB, consideration needs to be given as to whether the gates should be closed all of the time or only part-time. The evidence shows that the vast majority of the ASB happens at weekends, which could suggest that the gates are left open during the week. However evidence shows that some issues also occur during weekdays and over bank holidays/other holiday periods, so leaving the lane open during the week may displace and encourage people to change their behaviour to accommodate this.
- 3.29 The option to lock the gates only at weekends has also been explored with the council's Head of Green Space and Street Scene to consider the practicalities and costs to open the gates early on a Monday morning, and close them around lunchtime on a Friday. It is suggested that directing an officer to do this would cost approximately £40 per week (around £2,000 per year). It would also need to be undertaken via an agency contract because of the location of the lane and the difficulties of fitting this into existing council employee's work rotas, consequently this cannot not be easily contained within existing budgets or structures.
- 3.30 Enforcement of any potential breach of the PSPO will be the responsibility of both the council and police, dependant on the reported incident(s). Primarily breaches of the Order will be dealt with by issuing an FPN. It is suggested that the amount of this is set at the statutory level of £100 with a specified lower 'early payment' amount of £80 if paid within 14 days. Direction on what actions can and cannot be done in the PSPO defined area will be made clear on any notices. The Order itself will provide clarification to enable appropriate enforcement to be taken, providing clear information on the restrictions for vehicular access on the lane. In addition, communication campaigns will be undertaken with local residents and groups to ensure that they are aware of the PSPO and also the need for incidents to be reported to allow effective enforcement.

Options

- 3.31 There are three options available for members' consideration:
- (a) Option 1 – members support the making of a Public Spaces Protection Order and approve the use of gates to restrict access as defined under the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 whilst ensuring that these continue to provide access to pedestrians, horses and pedal cyclists.

This is the preferred option.

Within option 1, members are asked to approve if the gates should then be closed:

- (i) at all times (on all days through the week) or,
- (ii) part-time (from approximately 12.00 noon on Friday until approximately 7.00 am on Monday).

Both options permit vehicle access to land owners bordering the lane/plant works in the area for maintenance, and for emergency service vehicles.

- (b) Option 2 – members recommend changes to the Public Spaces Protection Order and plans to erect gates to restrict access under the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014. Any changes would have to be proportionate and based on supporting evidence of need.
- (c) Option 3 – members do not support the Public Spaces Protection Order under the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014.

4 Risk and financial implications

- 4.1 Morley Parish Council have agreed to be responsible for applying for funding to cover the full cost of buying the gates which may be in the region of £6,000. Erewash Borough Council would take on future responsibility for their general maintenance which, it is anticipated, can be incorporated within existing budgets.
- 4.2 There is a risk to the council in restricting all vehicular access (excepting any exemption for emergency services etc.) on the lane. However, the County Council are unable at this time to confirm whether there is a public right of way over the lane. Should this be determined, consultation and advice will be sought as to how to proceed and the PSPO dealt with appropriately. In addition, it is not within the council's jurisdiction to sanction any vehicle access over this lane without public rights being confirmed.
- 4.3 There is also a risk in restricting access when it is clear that not all users of the lane are behaving in an anti-social manner including those members of local or national groups or organisations. However, as evidenced in this report, it is believed that the PSPO is justified and that the majority of those directly affected by the proposed gates are in favour of the Order.
- 4.4 The Order can be challenged by application to the High Court and the council has a duty to ensure that any such Order is a proportionate response to the behaviour being perpetrated. Whilst the evidence shows the majority of the problems happen at weekends, it is acknowledged that the operational cost and difficulties of opening and closing the gates if option 3.31 (a) (ii) is approved may be disproportionate and/or unrealistic.

5 Legal implications

5.1 Under the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014, there are a number of requirements to fulfil as part of the process to consider a new PSPO. These include utilising data and evidence available and consultation in identifying why a PSPO is required and the nuisance it intends to deal with. As a minimum, each PSPO must set out:

- what the detrimental activities are;
- what is being prohibited and/or required, including any exemptions;
- the area covered;
- the consequences for breach; and
- the period for which it has effect.

It is suggested to members that this report sets out how all of the legal and statutory requirements have been fulfilled.

5.2 The council has the ability to make changes to the Order in response to issues raised in paragraph 3.23 above. Section 61 of the Act states that where a PSPO is in force, the local authority that made that order may vary it:

- (a) by increasing or reducing the restricted area; and
- (b) by altering or removing a prohibition or requirement included in the Order, or adding a new one.

5.3 PSPOs can also be legally challenged at the High Court under the 2014 Act on certain grounds. Any such application must be made within the period of six weeks beginning with the date on which the order or variation is made.

5.4 Under Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, the local authority has a duty to do all that it reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder.

6 Personnel implications

6.1 There are no personnel implications associated with this report as the enforcing officers of the council (primarily the Neighbourhood Wardens and Community Safety Team) and the police would be briefed through normal processes. Employees are already well versed in providing help and advice and where necessary dealing with enforcement and possible breaches.

7 Alignment to council priorities

7.1 The detrimental impact of anti-social behaviour and disorder and taking action(s) to reduce this are a priority for local residents. Approval of the PSPO will help to support achievement of the Corporate Plan priority of providing 'a clean, safe and welcoming borough'.

Background papers

None.

Contact officers

Lorraine Poyser, Director of Community Services

Telephone: 0115 907 2241

Email: lorraine.poyser@erewash.gov.uk

Katherine Thornhill, Community Safety Officer

Telephone: 0115 907 2244, ext 3584

Email: kat.thornhill@erewash.gov.uk

Key decision status

881.

Appendices

Appendix 1 - Map showing location of Brackley Gate/Moor Lane

Appendix 2 - Location of alternative routes

Appendix 3 - PSPO Survey questions

Appendix 4 - Draft Public Spaces Protection Order

Note: In preparing this report due regard has been had to human rights, prevention of crime and disorder, environmental, efficiency and health considerations as appropriate. An Equalities Impact Assessment has been completed or is not required. Relevant officers have been consulted in relation to any legal, financial, personnel or property implications and comments received are reflected in the report.

EREWASH



Erewash Borough Council has made a Public Spaces Protection Order which will restrict the use of this road.

From 27 August 2021 this road will be closed to all through traffic in motorised vehicles, motorised cycles, quad bikes or mini motos.

Pedestrians, pedal cycles and horse access will be maintained.

**For more information, please visit:
www.erewash.gov.uk/pspo**





Subject: RE: Holme Valley Parish Council - Request for information regarding a PSPO
From: Will Acornley <Will.Acornley@kirklees.gov.uk>
Date: 28/02/2022, 16:45
To: Deputy Clerk <deputyclerk@holmevalleyparishcouncil.gov.uk>
CC: Cllr Andy Wilson <cllrandywilson@holmevalleyparishcouncil.gov.uk>, Cllr Mary Blacka <cllrmaryblacka@holmevalleyparishcouncil.gov.uk>

Hi Rich,

Thank you for this, I was not aware of Erewash's recent PSPO and will have a look in detail at it, we had looked at several others around the Country though to learn from, all of which had very individual experiences.

We are at present moving through our internal governance processes discussion the issue, alongside other roads in the area that have similar issues, so we take a holistic approach and do not simply keep displacing the issue around the valley. There are no clear timeframes on this at present, but we are very conscious of the condition of the roads and the deterioration and are working with our Highways teams who are inspecting over the coming weeks to get an up-to-date picture. As this will play into any decision making.

The specification of barrier we were looking at and had priced is based on the one that we installed at Castle Hill:



This has been designed to withstand significant abuse which it will face, as would the ones at Yateholme. The people undertaking the ASB are in highly modified and powerful vehicles and do not take a barrier as a reason to stop, we have for example seen our large concrete blocks moved out the way at Cheesgate, which is no easy feat. Looking at the photo of the barrier at Erewash I can understand the cost difference, as it is much less robust and my initial reaction would be a concern over its ability to withstand the abuse it will receive. The locking mechanism for example appears to be reliant on the exposed pins at the centre of the gates.

Kind Regards

Will

-----Original Message-----

From: Deputy Clerk <deputyclerk@holmevalleyparishcouncil.gov.uk>

Sent: 18 February 2022 16:39

To: Will Acornley <Will.Acornley@kirklees.gov.uk>

Cc: Cllr Andy Wilson <cllrandywilson@holmevalleyparishcouncil.gov.uk>; Cllr Mary Blacka <cllmaryblacka@holmevalleyparishcouncil.gov.uk>

Subject: Re: Holme Valley Parish Council - Request for information regarding a PSPO

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Will

Please find attached a letter from Holme Valley Parish Council regarding the Yateholme PSPO together with some additional documentation.

Kind regards,

Rich

On 03/02/2022 16:39, Will Acornley wrote:

> Dear Rich,

> The short answer on Yateholme is that the estimated cost of the gates has come in prohibitively expensive, which could reach close to if not above a six-figure sum. This is not something that the Council currently has budget for or a level of spend we were anticipating.

>

> We are presently reviewing our options, with the damage to the rights

> of way being a concern to us and something we may need to act on

> differently in the interim. I have every sympathy for the impact of

> the Anti-Social Behaviour on the route and would encourage people to

> raise anything they see with the Police,

>

> Kind Regards

>

> Will

>

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Deputy Clerk <deputyclerk@holmevalleyparishcouncil.gov.uk>

> Sent: 21 January 2022 14:03

> To: Will Acornley <Will.Acornley@kirklees.gov.uk>

> Cc: Cllr Mary Blacka <cllmaryblacka@holmevalleyparishcouncil.gov.uk>;

> Cllr Andy Wilson <cllrandywilson@holmevalleyparishcouncil.gov.uk>

> Subject: Holme Valley Parish Council - Request for information

> regarding a PSPO

>

>
>
> CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

>
>
> Dear Will Acornley,

>
> Please find attached a letter from Holme Valley Parish Council requesting information on the progress of the Yateholme area Public Space Protection Order Number 1 of 2021.

>
> Kind regards,

>
> Rich

>
> --

> Rich McGill
> Deputy Clerk and Responsible Finance Officer

>
> Holme Valley Parish Council
> Holmfirth Civic Hall
> Huddersfield Road
> Holmfirth HD9 3AS

>
> Tel: 01484 687460
> Email: deputyclerk@holmevalleyparishcouncil.gov.uk

>
> <<http://www.kirklees.gov.uk>>
> [http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/assets/global/img/logo_kirkleesCouncil_x2.png]

>
> Website<<https://www.kirklees.gov.uk>> |
> News<<http://www.kirkleestogether.co.uk>> | Email
> Updates<<http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/stayconnected>> |
> Facebook<<https://www.facebook.com/liveinkirklees>> | Twitter
> <<https://twitter.com/KirkleesCouncil>>

>
> This email and any attachments are confidential. If you have received this email in error – please notify the sender immediately, delete it from your system, and do not use, copy or disclose the information in any way. Kirklees Council monitors all emails sent or received.

--
Rich McGill
Deputy Clerk and Responsible Finance Officer

Holme Valley Parish Council
Holmfirth Civic Hall
Huddersfield Road
Holmfirth HD9 3AS

Tel: 01484 687460
Email: deputyclerk@holmevalleyparishcouncil.gov.uk

Subject: Fwd: FW: TTRO 13511 - Footpath Closure - HOL/31/40 - (Amended Dates)

From: Deputy Clerk <deputyclerk@holmevalleyparishcouncil.gov.uk>

Date: 01/03/2022, 16:47

To: Kieran Bonner <Kieran.Bonner@kirklees.gov.uk>

Dear Kieran Bonner

For some reason, Holme Valley Parish Council was not included in this communication about a TTRO within the Holme Valley. Can you make sure that we are included in future?

With regard to Footpath HOL/31/40, Holme Valley Parish Council voted to express concerns about the length of this footpath closure.

Six months seems potentially excessive. Could you explain why such a lengthy closure is needed for a very popular footway?

Kind regards,

Rich

From: Cllr Charles Greaves <Charles.Greaves@kirklees.gov.uk>

Sent: 20 January 2022 16:14

To: Kieran Bonner <Kieran.Bonner@kirklees.gov.uk>

Cc: Cllr Terry Lyons <Terry.Lyons@kirklees.gov.uk>; Cllr PaulG White

<PaulG.White@kirklees.gov.uk>; Mrs Sally Barber (HV Clerk)

<clerk@holmevalleyparishcouncil.gov.uk>

Subject: Re: TTRO 13511 - Footpath Closure - HOL/31/40 - (Amended Dates)

Hello - I object to a 6 month closure over the spring and summer months when this is a popular walking route and forms a section of the River Holme way. Can you provide some details as to the nature of the work and why it will take so long ? I would be ok to accept a 2 month closure if the work warranted it but whomever is doing the job needs to get a move on and not sit on site for months !

The email has gone to Meltham TC and Kirkburton PC but not, Holme Valley PC which covers this area.

Thanks,