

Address: 66 Barnsley Road Huddersfield HD8 8NN

About the application

Application number: 2023/91280	
What is the application for?:	Quarrying operations for the extraction of clay, shale and incidental coal and s
Address of the site or building:	Bromley Farm Quarry, Barnsley Road, Upper Cumberworth, Huddersfield, HD8 8PD
Postcode:	S36 4HG

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	No
I am writing as a resident of Upper Cumberworth with a young family to express my serious concerns about the application for an extension to the previous Bromley Farm Quarry for extraction of clay, shale and incidental coal. My objections stem from the significant discrepancies and potentially misleading statements found within the submitted documentation. A635 Traffic Implications including Safety and Misleading information: My greatest concern centres on the potential escalation of HGV traffic along the already congested Upper Cumberworth A635 road particularly during peak school hours. This poses an immediate risk to pedestrians, cyclists, and school children. The application's attempt to present the proposed traffic as a minor addition contradicts the reality of restarting operations from a state of complete inactivity. Misleading statements like these could have influenced the feedback provided by external entities, such as Active England, leading to a potential oversight of key safety concerns. One particularly perplexing aspect of the application revolves around the presented traffic estimates. The figures are provided in a manner that is unclear and inconsistent, referencing a range of 60-120 HGV movements per day, tied to a 48-week working year despite suggesting extraction would occur in spring and summer. This calculation lacks clarity, which in turn raises doubts about the accuracy and reliability of the data and thus conclusions drawn from it. Furthermore, the application's portrayal of the proposed traffic as a mere extension of existing activity overlooks the fact that mineral extraction ceased in 2014. This oversight distorts the true impact of the application which would, in reality, be the starting of activities from a baseline of zero. This has significant potential to skew perception of the plans by non-local statutory bodies during the consultation phase. Consultation Process and Timing: The application process and the Local Planning Authority's actions have been far from	

The application process and the Local Planning Authority's actions have been far from ideal. Placing a single site notice well into the consultation period, during the holiday season, not only limits residents' ability to participate but also raises questions about the sincerity of community engagement. Given the far-reaching implications of the proposal, particularly on the A635 road, this approach falls short of the transparency and inclusiveness expected in such proceedings. It is essential to acknowledge that a multitude of issues have been raised by local residents despite the limited timeframe available for expression, echoing concerns raised in the parish response.

Inconsistencies and Credibility:

The application exhibits several inconsistencies that undermine its credibility. For example, the Air Quality and Dust Assessment, produced by Miller Goodall on behalf of Silkstone Environmental Ltd., references the location as "Gantham" multiple times, casting doubt on the thoroughness and accuracy of their work. The portrayal of road access is also inconsistent, with plans depicting a single lane while claiming two lanes elsewhere and HGVs being shown to leave the access road towards the household waste recycling facility (a dead end), reiterating the fact there really isn't space for them on the existing road. These discrepancies, along with inconsistencies in operational timings (application and supporting information differ on whether work starts at 7h00 or 7h30) and sewerage waste management details (no septic tank in application but used in supporting information), highlight the need for meticulous and reliable documentation. Similarly the description of location in 7.2.2 and 7.5.20 of the supporting statement are different by 300% and refer to the distance of Upper Cumberworth to the "village" presumed to mean "site." As well as undermining reliable assessment, including by those Kirklees have consulted, the lack of care shown in things that are easily visible to all can reasonably be inferred to be likely mirrored in the technical information provided as well.

Inappropriateness of assumptions in Air Quality and Dust Assessment

The Air Quality and Dust Assessment is premised on being a continuation of existing activity. Such activity has not taken place for nearly a decade (2014), and the local community has changed, new housing developments have occurred and increased traffic has resulted. The assumption that it is valid to scope out of the assessment aspects of the activity, elsewhere highlighted to be 120 vehicle movements or higher a day that are new against current baseline, is entirely unjustified (5.2.1 "It was also agreed [with Kirklees Council] that vehicle emissions will be scoped out of the assessment as there is no increase in vehicle generation from the extension."; 5.3.1 "The extension will be worked as a continuation of existing activities. No changes to the extraction rate or vehicle movements are proposed. The extension will be worked using the existing traffic movements of the recently restored Bromley Farm Quarry."). As such the methodology is irrelevant if the underpinning assumptions are incorrect. It is disturbing that these seem to have been "agreed" with Kirklees Council. The response from Kirklees Council's Environmental Health (Pollution & Noise Control) also indicates a need to redo this assessment on the basis of a new works not existing works before furthering the application. Public consultation should be given for any new information provided.

Environmental Impact and Biodiversity:

The ecological report's limitations are cause for significant concern regarding the environmental implications of the proposal. The absence of clear figures and justifications for habitat evaluations and little comment on the proximity to the Dearne Valley woodland raises questions about the proposal's commitment to preserving biodiversity.

Objections continued in email due to word limit