

Address: 23 Rockwood Rise Huddersfield HD8 8SN

### 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

The proposed development raises serious concerns about its impact on the local area. The scale of traffic, environmental risks and lack of clear planning make it an unsuitable site for housing.

Firstly, the number of heavy vehicle movements is far too high for the local infrastructure to support. The developer claims there will be around 550 HGV trips to remove material, but based on standard load weights, that figure is underestimated—closer to 650 trips is more realistic. This doesn't even include additional lorry movements for bringing in material (around 1,650 tonnes) or disposing of waste. Over a six-month period, this could mean over 20 HGV journeys per day on Cumberworth Lane—a narrow road not designed for such activity.

Noise is another major concern. The proposed use of rotary drilling equipment, which operates at hazardous volume levels (90–105 decibels), would cause significant disturbance for nearby residents. Despite this, there are no detailed plans to manage or reduce noise.

On top of these issues, the site itself is unstable and poorly understood. The applicant has not provided sufficient geological data to assess whether the land is suitable for development. Without this, there's no way to fully evaluate the environmental impact or public safety risk.

More troubling, however, is the scale of excavation being proposed. The application includes plans to dig out the centre of the site—removing thousands of cubic metres of material, including coal. According to the applicant's own reports, approximately 4,400 cubic metres of coal may be extracted. These figures are not precise and are based on unproven assumptions. If those estimates are wrong, the actual volume—and therefore the disruption could be far worse.

This level of excavation strongly resembles opencast coal mining. The fact that the applicant claims the coal will not be sold commercially offers little reassurance—especially since no plan is provided for where the coal will go, how it will be handled, or who will be responsible for it. Whether it's sold, stored, or burned, all options conflict with current environmental policies and local priorities.

The applicant attempts to justify the proposal by referencing a small nearby housing project (Springhead Gardens). But this comparison is misleading. That development had far fewer risks, involved no coal seams, and still created serious problems like unregulated spoil tipping and dust. The two sites are not comparable in terms of geology, scale, or impact.

Given the disruption, environmental uncertainty, and likelihood of coal extraction, this proposal should not be considered a legitimate housing plan. It contradicts several key planning policies—particularly LP24, LP36, LP52, and LP53 of the Kirklees Local Plan, as well as relevant sections of the National Planning Policy Framework (Chapters 8, 15, and 17).

This site is unsuitable for residential use, and the application should be refused.