

Address: 5A Leak Hall Crescent Huddersfield HD8 8RZ

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

Ref: 2024/62/93458/E

We wish to strongly object to this planning application on the following grounds;

This application is just a rehash of the one already refused and does not alter the plans in any substantive way.

Environmental: There will still have to be a substantial quantity of coal extracted from the site, which is why the previous application was refused. The developer claims that they will not dispose of the coal commercially, yet makes no mention of how this will actually be processed. I am sure that someone will be selling this coal, as it would be very expensive to send to landfill. The applicant also claims that the site has the same geology as the at Springhead Gardens. However, I am not aware of any coal having to be extracted from that site during development. The applicant seems to try to imply that their strategy has changed from the previous plan, however it is the same; the ground works, removal of coal, and remediation associated with the proposed development would result in an unacceptable number of vehicle movements and unacceptable environmental impacts.

Kirklees Local Plan: Whilst Kirklees council has to meet targets for new housing, the proposed 62 homes aren't going to make a massive difference in reaching this. Also, as the developer concedes, this is below the required density of housing per hectare, which also means that this development does not meet the minimum requirement of affordable housing for a 1.9 hectare site, as set out by the Kirklees Local Plan.

Privacy: We still object to being directly overlooked by the proposed houses at the back of us. We believe these to be too close, particularly when taking into account the topography differential.

Flooding: We still have major concerns about increased flooding in the area, including on our property.

Traffic: In our opinion, the proposed access to the site is unsuitable, being too close to the part of Cumberworth Lane that narrows to the point where in essence it becomes single track, and with only a very narrow pavement on the opposite side of the road.

Please take these comments into account, but due to GDPR, please remove my name and address.