

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?	Yes

Why is the consultation period so short?

This application is for a new quarry not an extension as quarrying ceased and landfill completed some years ago. As such it should not be admitted.

It is still not clear what type of vehicle the applicant intends to use - there is conflicting information which has a bearing on the impact of these additional 60 return journeys - or whatever they finally arrive at. Whilst good to note Highways' objection to the use of rural roads (which are still used for 'current' journeys) the proposed new route is fraught with danger. The Sovereign crossroads is notoriously dangerous and will become more so with the addition of a further high volume of HGVs. According to 4.7 the junction operates within theoretical capacity but over normal requirements with Holmfirth, Barnsley and Penistone arms 'struggling with existing volumes' There is no risk assessment evident in the modelling and I cannot believe Highways can accept this.

There is a 9% gradient on the descent to New Mill where heavily laden trucks (of size still to be confirmed) are descending into backed up traffic which is not visible on most occasions until the last minute. The risk increases with frequency. The junction is on the walking route to Holmfirth High School and whilst acknowledged there is an issue with theoretical capacity there is no risk assessment evident. A disaster waiting to happen. Clearly there is no 'reasonably safe' route from Bromley Farm to the Wavin plant.

Does the Council not have a duty to consider the 'cumulative' effect of adding these proposed additional movement to existing quarry/HGV movement and projected traffic from the very large number of houses being built?

There is still no mention of any mitigation regarding _____ on the site which are legally protected as previously reported. Is this to be ignored and who will be liable for any resulting prosecution?

The Supreme Court judgement in *Finch v Surrey CC* conveys a requirement for planning authorities to consider the carbon footprint resulting from extraction/conversion/use/disposal not only for new applications but those in progress but as yet undecided. This may well fall into scope but there is no such assessment in this application.

My opinion is that the applicant has treated residents and indeed Kirklees Council with contempt with the stream of ambiguous and incomplete data and would urge you to dismiss this application