

Address: 6B Leak Hall Crescent Huddersfield Hd88rz

About the application

Application number: 2024/93458	
What is the application for?:	Erection of residential development for 62 dwellings including grouting remedial
Address of the site or building:	land at, Cliff Hill, Denby Dale, Huddersfield, HD8
Postcode:	YO1 0LT

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	No
<p>This objection pertains to the ongoing appeal for a previously refused planning application with the same proposal. I believe this application (and appeal) is essentially a “Trojan horse” aimed at enabling the opencast mining of coal. It is clear that the applicant does not intend to carry out the development themselves, as they are reportedly in talks with various developers, including national housebuilders. Kirklees officers previously refused this application for three interconnected reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The ground works, coal removal, and subsequent remediation associated with the development would lead to an excessive number of vehicle movements and significant environmental impacts.2. Due to the unknown conditions beneath the site, there is insufficient information to fully assess the environmental impact of these works.3. It has not been proven that the site is suitable for residential development. <p>As such, the proposal conflicts with Policies LP24, LP36, LP52, and LP53 of the Kirklees Local Plan, as well as Chapters 8, 15, and 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>The applicant claims that 550 HGV movements will be required to remove materials, but this figure is inaccurate. Based on 20-tonne loads, the actual number of movements—using the lowest estimate—would be closer to 650. Additionally, the applicant estimates three HGV movements each way per day, although no time frame is provided. Assuming six months of operation, this would amount to 244 HGVs per month, or 11 per working day in each direction. Furthermore, waste materials, coal, and an estimated 1,650 tonnes of material to be brought in will all require transportation. Cumberworth Lane cannot accommodate this additional traffic.</p> <p>A report by GRM Development Solutions Ltd. (31/5/2024) indicates that large tracked rotary rigs would be used for ground works, which typically generate noise levels between 90 and 105 decibels—falling into the ‘hazardous’ to ‘highly hazardous’ range (source: ‘The Driller’ online). The applicant does not address noise mitigation in their plans.</p> <p>The conditions beneath the site are inadequately understood. To stabilize the site, the applicant proposes grouting and capping, with potential excavation in the site’s center. This excavation may involve open-pit mining of a thick coal seam (the Whinmoor</p>	

This excavation may involve opencast mining of a thick coal seam (the Whinmoor Seam). The original 2022 application (2022/62/91911/E) proposed extracting 12,000 tonnes of coal and excavating to a depth of 10 meters, just meters from neighboring properties. The revised application removes the explicit mining plan but states that excavation may still be needed at the site's center, involving approximately 4,400 cubic meters of coal. The estimates for coal volume are based on assumptions about the seam's thickness and how much has already been extracted, and these estimates could significantly change as work progresses.

The proposed excavation, if the estimates are inaccurate, could result in a much larger coal volume than anticipated, thus affecting all projections for timescales, vehicle movements, and pollution. Furthermore, no assessment has been made regarding the disposal of the mined coal. If the coal is to be sold or combusted, this would contravene local and national environmental policies. The applicant's claim that it does not intend to dispose of the coal for commercial purposes does not preclude delegating this task to another party, and there remains no clear plan for how the coal will be dealt with.

The applicant points to the small Springhead Gardens development as a precedent, claiming it proceeded without significant environmental or health risks. However, this site is not comparable. Springhead Gardens is accessed by a minor road with no through traffic and does not sit on a coal seam. The remediation for that site involved substantial HGV movements and required much more material than anticipated. Moreover, the lack of a Groundworks Management Plan resulted in breaches of conditions, including unregulated noise and dust from loose spoil being tipped onto adjoining land. The geology of the two sites is also different, with the Whinmoor seam affecting this site but not Springhead Gardens.

While Paragraph 11c of the NPPF suggests a presumption in favor of sustainable development, I contend that this site is not suitable for residential development due to the need for extensive coal removal. As such, the site is not sustainable