

## About the application

Application number: 2022/91911	
What is the application for?:	Erection of residential development consisting of 47 dwellings with associated h
Address of the site or building:	land at, Cliff Hill, Denby Dale, Huddersfield, HD8
Postcode:	YO19 5LP

## User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	Yes
<p>Having taken time to study all the documents currently available (more seem to be being added!) I am writing to give comments primarily on the many drainage issues raised, as this seems very poorly understood by the developers. Other people have commented on many aspects which I also agree with, and I hope to make some comment on these later.</p> <p><b>EXISTING WATERCOURSE</b> The plans do not take account of an existing watercourse which runs from the paddock at Leak Hall Farm under the public footpath/track emerging under a hawthorn tree around where 'plot 26' is shown on the plans. The trough that this watercourse emerges into is now obscured by brambles, and has been missed in site surveys. It then disappears back underground. We suspect that it runs down to join the watercourse/culvert emerging behind the new houses on Leak Hall Crescent. Flooding has occurred downstream and on the land above the public footpath / track at this point occasionally, but this February above the footpath it was the worst flooding it has been in the 25 years we have lived here. We suspect this is due to blockages further down the culverts, caused by one or other of the new housing projects. If this is the same culvert that has been overflowing onto the library car park, then it is already causing problems. This development will cause more problems. The housing plans do not accommodate this upper watercourse at all.</p> <p><b>LEVELS</b> : It is hard to work out the levels, particularly on the roads, but the new road near plots 26-31 seems to run level or even downhill from the TPO Oak tree towards the public footpath with could cause flooding blocking the footpath.</p> <p><b>OTHER CULVERTS</b>: We believe they may also be other culverts or large clay pipes crossing into the site under the public footpath/ track and into the development site – we have found at least one other when digging.</p> <p><b>EXCAVATION &amp; FILL</b>: The very brief and rushed-looking 'Remediation Strategy' makes no reference to dealing with water during the work. This is mentioned as a risk in the Phase 2 Mining report. As well as existing springs, surface water &amp; watercourses, surely the 'voids' are full of water? This will need to be addressed – how? Perhaps by pumping out of the excavation 24 hours a day? More noise! Surely this poses safety issues during the works to the workers, and to neighbouring properties, residents, pets and wildlife.</p> <p><b>SUSTAINABLE DRAINAGE</b>: The SUDS feature raises several issues. The design</p>	

**SUSTAINABLE DRAINAGE:** The SUDS feature raises several issues. The design does not seem likely to form a useful or attractive public open space – as claimed – nor to be a good sustainable drainage solution. The basin has a completely flat bottom, so will always be boggy, if not wet; it may be below the water table. It appears that the basin is surrounded by 1 in 3 slopes and retaining walls, and inlet features. This will limit its use by residents, and if it retains water, could be unsafe for recreation. The landscaping appears to consist of two trees! And will the basin need to be close mown to ensure it remains available to hold maximum water and does not become full of brambles and scrub – who will do this and pay for it?

When full, the water is retained by an engineered bund across the slope, and does not sit within the natural landform. There are houses immediately below this bund, which when full will be holding back 2 metres depth of water – this seems very risky in the short term, when all the land has been disturbed, and in long term. What happens if the bund overflows? Or if it is weakened by foxes, rabbits etc? also, the figures used for run-off calculations are said to be based on a greenfield site, but after the ‘excavation & fill solution’ this will all be made ground not greenfield, with no root zone, no fissures, less percolation and so greatly increased run-off. If the figures are even slightly wrong and the basin is not big enough – this will be a disaster.

If this is the major area of ‘public open space’ in the development – it is very poor. 4 are claimed in total, another is presumably under the TPO Oak Tree, are the other 2 the verges at the site entrance? – these areas are not at all suitable for children’s play or recreation. All the areas where my children used to play and meet up with friends on Leak Hall Crescent have now been built on – adding to the pressure for public space. There is none around here and this development does not provide any.

**CAPACITY IN THE DRAINS** – Existing drains along Cumberworth Lane and the main Wakefield Road do not cope in existing conditions. There is a steady flow of water running down Cumberworth Lane whenever it rains and one has to jump across it to cross the road from the public footpath / track to get to the pavement by the Methodist Chapel. On Wakefield Road, it can be a small river after heavy rain. I have already mentioned the problems caused by diverting the culvert to build on the old school – coming up quickly and causing users of the library to have to wade to their cars. This development can only make this worse in general, but if they are connecting into this culvert in particular it will greatly add to the volume of water and cause enormous problems.

The relationship of this land and its history to drainage and water movement including mining make it unsuitable for affordable development as planned, so it should be found an alternative use - land is needed as a ‘sponge’ to help regulate water in the village, and it could offer a much-needed area of public space. Development causes too many issues. It is being driven by commercial pressures towards coal mining and mansions – not the original plan vision! More existing properties will be adversely affected than will be created. I object to this proposal.