

From: [Carole Wadsworth](#)
To: [DCAdmin](#)
Subject: Planning Comments from Denby Dale Parish Council
Date: 20 December 2022 19:44:37

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

2022/62/93587/E	30, Savile Street, Emley, Huddersfield, HD8 9RX Erection of single storey rear extension with associated external alterations	20/12/2022	No objections	Nicole Helliwell
2022/62/93781/E	43, Paddock Way, Skelmanthorpe, Huddersfield, HD8 9GW Alterations to integral garage to extend living accommodation, erection of detached garage and alterations to windows	20/12/2022	No objections	Elenya Jackson
2022/CL/93701/E	Barn House, Wood Street, Skelmanthorpe, Huddersfield, HD8 9BN Certificate of lawfulness for proposed solar PV roof panels [within a Conservation Area]	20/12/2022	No objections	Edward Cheseldine
2022/62/92648/E	4, Bluehills Lane, Lower Cumberworth, Huddersfield, HD8 8RQ Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of part single storey and part two storey rear extension with external alterations	20/12/2022	No objections however neighbour representations were noted	Craig Hewlett
2022/62/93805/E	40, Pennine Rise, Scissett, Huddersfield, HD8 9JE Demolition of existing garage and erection of two and single storey side extension	20/12/2022	No objections	Craig Hewlett
			Objections raised as before: Councillors wish to object to this as follows: The application itself contains some errors of fact. - Assessment of flood risk: will the proposal increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. This has been answered 'no' but it is believed to be a clear 'yes'. There are springs marked to the north of the site, which drain down the hill. There is also an area into which these springs empty, where water is held, so that it seeps down the hill rather than rushes. There are sinks marked adjacent to the site. - There is a beck that runs in the valley at the back of the houses on Leak Hall Lane, so the claim that 'there is no watercourse near the site' is false. - Biodiversity and geological conservation. The applicant claims no knowledge of animal life, but it currently includes birds (including owls), bats, common toads and insects. - The applicant claims no industrial or commercial processes or machinery whereas the 'remediation plan' includes an open cast coal mine using various huge excavators as the developer's site investigation 'has revealed several challenges including shafts, voids and seams.' This plan (effectively an open cast mine) includes a 'coal processing area' next to the public footpath and in close proximity to homes and a 'temporary overburden heap' right next to the footpath and at the top of the valley from which the springs feed the beck. Runoff is thus bound to enter the water system and contaminate it. It must be asked why this area of wet land at the head of a watercourse is considered suitable for such a spoil heap. In addition to these factual errors: - Harland Resources (the mining operation) state that they are aware of the TPO relating to the tree in the development and a protection zone will be established throughout these works. The tree survey says that developers have already damaged many trees with machinery or by depositing debris on them. A length of hedgerow has also been recently destroyed by heavy machinery. - The air quality assessment and environmental impact statements make no mention of the proposed open cast mine and its deleterious effects. - The area to the north of the site is a possible deserted medieval settlement (West Yorkshire Historic Environment Record MWY2516) (see report from Archaeological Advisory Service). It is reported that earthwork remains of possible house platforms were observed here. This location along with a wider area around Leak Hall is a Class III Area of Archaeological Importance and a non-designated heritage asset. Evidence of medieval rural settlement is rare in the county in general and any remains of this date encountered would be of up to regional importance. The Archaeological Advisory Service recommends that, in accordance with appropriate policies, the developer be required to provide the Planning Authority with an archaeological evaluation, based on appropriate analytical methods, of the full archaeological implications of the proposed development. It recommends that this evaluation should be carried out prior to the determination of this application as required by the NPPF. - Paragraph 111 of the NPPF states that "Development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe." It is believed this to be the case. - The Transport Assessment begins from the false premise that Cumberworth Lane is 'lightly trafficked' (3.2.1 TA Report). There is a weekday average of 167 traffic movements one way and 189 the other per hour at peak times (i.e. around 6 per minute) (see their own data); hardly 'light'. Their own speed summary has over a third of weekday traffic movements exceeding the speed limit on average in one direction (northwest) and over half exceeding the speed limit in the other direction (southeast). - The TA assumes 'minimal impact' on the wider road network. It is estimated 47 households each with at least one car, many with two (they are mostly 4 bedroomed properties). At an average 1.5	

2022/62/91911/E	land at, Cliff Hill, Denby Dale, Huddersfield, HD8Erection of residential development consisting of 48 dwellings with associated highways and landscaping	20/12/2022	cars per household that is a likely increase in traffic on this blind bend of approximately 150 cars per day (assuming just one return journey for each vehicle). In addition, it is proposed, whilst the mining takes place, to have 18 coal wagon movements per day plus other associated machinery. The Planning Committee therefore objects on the grounds of: • Errors in the application, particularly in relation to watercourses. • Damage to biodiversity and protected species such as bats. • Work required by the Archaeological Advisory Service. • Inappropriate housing for this area. Four bedroom 'executive' type homes are not needed for young couples or older people wishing to downsize in the village. It can only lead to an increase in commuter traffic. The density of the housing is also high. • None of the housing could be considered 'affordable'. • The 'remediation' strategy, required to make a site which 'has revealed several challenges including shafts, voids and seams' usable, is essentially an unregulated open cast coal mine, whose workings will interfere with wildlife, watercourses and archaeological evidence. • The transport assessment is based on the false premise that Cumberworth Lane is 'lightly trafficked.' • In addition, there is no mention of S106 (or whatever it is now). Do developers no longer have to even pretend to mitigate their destruction by providing local services/support?	Richard A Gilbert
-----------------	---	------------	---	-------------------

Carole Wadsworth BSc (Hons) MSc
 Clerk to Denby Dale Parish Council/RFO
 Denby Dale Parish Council, Council Offices, 24 Commercial Road, Skelmanthorpe, HD8 9DA
 Tel: 01484 861239 /Mobile 07947 355930 (during office hours)
 Email: clerk@denbydale.com
 Web: www.denbydale.com (see our Privacy Notice on the website)
 (working pattern: Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday)