

Address: 12 Coppin Hall Lane Mirfield WF14 0EL

About the application

Application number: 2024/93079	
What is the application for?:	Change of use and alterations to care home unit 2 to form 10 self-contained apar
Address of the site or building:	The Radcliffe, 444, Huddersfield Road, Mirfield, WF14 0EE
Postcode:	WF14 0EE

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	No
<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I am writing to formally object to planning application 2024/93079, relating to the proposed development and parking arrangements adjacent to "The Radcliffe, Unit 1" and "Unit 2" as shown in the submitted plans on the Kirklees Council planning portal.</p> <p>I am a resident of Coppin Hall Lane, a property that directly borders the proposed development. I have significant concerns regarding the impact this proposal will have on the amenity, safety, and quality of life for myself and surrounding residents.</p> <p>My objections are outlined in detail below:</p> <p>Noise Pollution</p> <p>1. The proximity of the proposed car park—particularly the bays located directly beneath our rear window, which also serves as the only fire escape from that part of the house—raises serious concerns about noise disruption. As someone who works from home, I rely on a quiet environment, yet this development would introduce frequent disturbances from vehicle engines, door slamming, alarms, and conversations at all hours, including early mornings, evenings, and weekends. This would significantly affect my ability to work, rest, and enjoy my home. In addition, the proposed apartments at the rear would result in a loss of privacy and a permanent shift in the character of this boundary, introducing additional residential activity. I am also concerned about disruption during the construction phase itself, which will likely be noisy and prolonged.</p> <p>This level of intrusion is inconsistent with Policy LP52 of the Kirklees Local Plan which requires that developments do not cause or suffer from significant levels of noise or disturbance.</p> <p>2. Light Pollution</p> <p>The plan will likely include artificial lighting to serve the car park, and combined with headlights from vehicles, will cause constant glare into my living and sleeping areas</p>	

headlights from vehicles, will cause constant glare into my living and sleeping areas. Given the angle and proximity, this would intrude on my home's internal spaces and outdoor areas during nighttime hours, undermining residential amenity.

This is in direct conflict with Policy LP24(b) of the Kirklees Local Plan which requires development to protect the amenity of future and neighbouring occupiers.

3. Air Quality

With the addition of multiple parking bays directly adjacent/against my property, there will be increased emissions from idling vehicles directly under our windows for which we already get from the cars which currently park there for the residential home, especially during peak hours. This not only poses a health risk but is wholly inappropriate next to a residential dwelling.

This contradicts Policy LP51 which promotes development that protects air quality and contributes to public health.

4. Privacy and Overlooking

The proposed parking bays are located immediately adjacent to my boundary, allowing individuals to look directly into my windows and private space. This will fundamentally compromise privacy and sense of seclusion, especially from higher vehicles or standing occupants.

This contravenes Policy LP24(c), which stipulates that development should provide a high standard of amenity for existing and future occupiers.

5. Safety and Security

The location of the bays directly under a critical fire exit at the rear of my property raises serious safety concerns. The fire exit must be kept clear at all times, yet this plan facilitates constant obstruction. Moreover, the increased foot and vehicle traffic raises the risk of property damage, theft, and antisocial behaviour—none of which have been addressed by the applicant.

This conflicts with Paragraph 130(f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which stresses that developments should create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible.

6. Traffic and Highway Safety

The junction at Coppin Hall Lane and Huddersfield Road is already hazardous, particularly with traffic from Battyeford Playing Fields and the John Cotton car parks. Vehicles leaving The Radcliffe have poor visibility of oncoming traffic, and this plan will only exacerbate an already dangerous situation.

Additionally, Coppin Hall Lane is often reduced to a single track due to existing on-street parking, which makes ingress and egress even more problematic. Overspill parking from the proposed development would severely worsen this.

This goes against NPPF Paragraph 111, which advises against developments that would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

7. Residential Amenity and Quality of Life

The cumulative impact of noise, light, air pollution, lack of privacy, and safety concerns will permanently erode the residential character and enjoyment of my home. The character of the area is primarily residential, and this car park development imposes a commercial intensity that is entirely at odds with that.

This represents a direct conflict with the overarching aims of Chapter 12 of the NPPF, "Achieving well-designed places."

8. Policy Conflicts

Kirklees Local Plan Policy LP24: Design and amenity

Kirklees Local Plan Policy LP51: Protection of air quality

Kirklees Local Plan Policy LP52: Protection from noise

Kirklees Local Plan Policy LP21: Highway safety

NPPF Chapter 8: Promoting healthy and safe communities

NPPF Chapter 12: Achieving well-designed places

This application, as it stands, fails to comply with both local and national planning policy, particularly with respect to protecting residential amenity and ensuring safe and suitable access.

In summary, this proposal will cause significant disruption to our amenity, safety, privacy, and quality of life. It contradicts several key planning policies and fails to provide appropriate mitigations. I strongly urge the Planning Committee to refuse this application.

Thank you for your consideration