

**Email to members of Development
Committee from [REDACTED] on 12 August 2021**

Hello Councillors

It has been some time since [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] visited Warland Farm to discuss the Listed Building Consent and Planning Applications in further detail. Following on from their feedback and the comments made by Todmorden Town Council in its initial consultation, additional, explanatory information has been produced to tackle the concerns raised. (We note that in TCC's original comment 'further information would be required' in order to make a proper assessment....).

Calderdale Council Planning and Conservation Officers have indicated that they will begin assessment of the application now that the Planning Application has been validated (as they want to deal with it in tandem with the Listed Building Consent application). Many of the comments on-line thus far do not relate to Listed Building Consent and have pre-empted the Full Application – which is only now current. We would suggest that many of the comments are indeed inappropriate before full consideration has been made by Council, and before all of the Full Application documents have been provided. Irrespective of wanting the opportunity at least for the Applicants to respond, they would also benefit from some rigorous fact-checking.

Because we are not sure how long it might take for the upload of additional information to be done (as workload is clearly very challenging for Council Officers at the moment), we are sending the information to you directly in order that hopefully you can peruse in advance of your next TTC meeting. [REDACTED] indicated that this meeting would either be 18th August or 15th September.

We also note a very unfortunate overlap of communications - in that we are providing this additional information as requested, but a letter dated 3rd August, has in the meantime been sent to Richard Seaman condemning the application (principally on grounds of traffic increase). This letter from the Development Committee is subsequent to the original comment made requesting further information, and has now been uploaded to the Council planning website. We can only assume that this is in part a result of significant pressure applied by public objectors. No request for additional information from ourselves in respect of application issues has been made to us by the Development Committee before submitting their letter. We feel that the application has therefore not been assessed in a balanced way and this is unfair.

We would be very grateful if you could therefore review the contents of this email and the attached information and give renewed consideration to the comments that you have made.

The attached documents provides a strong degree of objectivity in respect of traffic issues, in comparison to a number of erroneous and hyperbolic comments regarding traffic submitted by members of the public on the CMBC planning website.

There are also a high number of other erroneous comments now on the CMBC planning website which are addressed and clarified in the attached FAQ's.

As architects/agents for the application with 35 years of experience of working with Listed Buildings and historic structures in the valley – a local building stock of which we are personally very proud – we feel very comfortable with the approach to developing the site and buildings, in order to ensure their long term viability, whilst maintaining and enhancing their heritage features. We would be very happy to discuss your comments about the design approach in greater detail if you wish. In the meantime please consider the attached animation – showing the very limited visual impact that the proposal has on the appearance of the area and the host buildings.

We feel very strongly that this is an extremely timely and worthwhile project (putting it very mildly indeed), and that we must all be supportive of any serious attempts to synthesise economic, environmental and socially sustainability now. We cannot let this extraordinary, flagship sustainability project flounder in response to what we feel are spurious comments.

If any of you would like to discuss this further then please do not hesitate to contact me. The offer the applicants have made of hosting Councillors at Warland remains, and we will endeavour to provide you with anything else that you require in order to aid your reappraisal of the scheme.

We would like to request the following: Please make us aware of any outstanding issues before any comments are returned to CMBC in order that we have an opportunity to respond.

Please also note that direct responses to the specific points made in your letter to Richard Seaman have been provided at the end of this email.

Full scale prints of the application drawings are on the way to Susan so as to be accessible by members.

Many thanks for your time.

Best regards

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted signature]

Hawdon Russell Architects

52 Wharf Street, Sowerby Bridge, West Yorkshire HX6 2AE
www.hra86.com Tel: (01422) 834291 Email: mm@hra86.com

Responses to [REDACTED] letter from [REDACTED]

[para 4/line 2]...at best a single track: the lane is a well-established paved road along its whole length; it presents no difficulty to passage by cars.

[P4/L4]...not for the likely numbers: this emotive statement has been made without understanding the likely numbers. We have explained to the Mayor, during her visit, and in writing that we expect an increase in traffic of 3 cars per day, using real attendance data from recent events at Warland Farm. A detailed traffic survey in July and August shows that this increase is insignificant compared to current traffic and compared to the lane's capacity for cars.

[P5/L4] There is strong potential...: this emotive statement is not based in the facts of this application. None of the facilities and events proposed will be open or advertised to the general public so there will not be unexpected visitors.

[P5/L4]...cars backing down: this is also an emotive statement without basis. There is ample space at the farmyard for cars to turn around; the phrase "extremely dangerous" is unwarranted.

[P6] The parking used by residents and the parking proposed are entirely separate. The recent study has shown that, on average, there are at least five spaces available near the canal, even though other, remote residents are leaving cars there for days. Rather than reducing parking for residents, this proposal will make more spaces available.

[P7] Letting a cottage for Airbnb should not increase traffic nor parking issues. The same number and types of people will likely be staying, using the same cars as would residents, but the occupancy rate is bound to be less than 100%.

[Bullet point 1/line 1] Unlike the previous...: This is a listed building issue. The application does reveal the existing windows and doors of the Mickle Barn. It does not, like the previously approved application, insert inappropriate arched windows in places that have no reference to the existing fenestration.

[BP1/L2] The width of the build...: Only the New Barn adds to the width of the farm's footprint. It has been established in application [3058658] that the construction of such a barn at Warland Farm should be permitted by Prior Approval and is not a listed building issue, except in the way that it connects with the other barns.

[BP1/L3]...expanse of solar cells on the roof. It is important to deal in facts, not emotive language. There will be a few solar panels on small storage structures at the edge of the farmyard, invisible from within the yard, from the A6033 and from the canal towpath. In this age of climate emergency, it is the responsibility of everyone, especially the Council, to be open to proposals for green energy production and to deal in facts.

[BP1/L4] "Plastic awnings" are nowhere in the proposal; we proposed polycarbonate windows to the greenhouses—a normal material to use on any farm—and have

since replaced this idea with traditional, ecologically sound materials, glass and waxed canvas.

[BP1/L5]...to one in the USA: this phrase, used without reference to any facts, appears to reveal bias in this discussion.

[BP2.1] With reference to 99_00106_FUL—462456 (Planning Inspector's report from 2000), the inspector did not find the lane dangerous because it is "...steep, narrow, winding, very uneven and has blind bends": these are Development Committee's words.

In section 10, the inspector believes that the exit onto the A6033 is dangerous and suggests "sub-standard sight lines". This is not true and there are adequate, 120m x 2.4m visual splays in both directions. The road speed limit has since been reduced; and we believe no such predicted accidents have been recorded. The inspector's opinion that Warland was at that time "not sufficiently robust to serve existing demands..." is clearly defeated by the recent survey. They state, in section 9, that the "dozen homes could generate 60 vehicular movements each day with each movement likely to cause conflict at some point..." This is not borne out by recent traffic data despite the ensuing increases in dwellings, subdivisions and businesses in Warland.

[BP2.2] The proposers will be installing a publicly-accessible defibrillation unit as part of this development which will greatly increase the chances of survival for such cases.

[BP2.2; 2.3] The proposers would welcome Council's and residents' initiatives to resolve these serious issues rather than allowing them to remain. As shown by real data in the recent traffic survey, this proposal will have an insignificant impact upon traffic on the lane. Parking will be increased beyond the capacity required by the development so access by emergency vehicles will be improved.

[BP2.4] There is one drain running under the road, belonging to the proposers and, despite complaints, Councils have done nothing about restricting these oversized trucks. The proposers encourage the residents and Council to agree speed, weight and size limits for vehicles using the lane because it is these that present the greatest threat to buildings, walls and trees along the lane. It will then be a community responsibility to monitor and respond to these vehicles.