

## About the application

Application number: 2024/62/93458/e	
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?	Yes
Planning Application Refusal – Summary of Key Objections	
<p>1. No Material Difference from Previous Applications This application is virtually identical to the previously rejected application (2023/62/92191/E) and one already reviewed by the Supreme Court. The only difference is the applicant's company name following the previous one going into liquidation. Reassessing a materially unchanged application wastes public resources, and the previous refusal should stand.</p> <p>2. Misleading Precedent Reference The applicant references the Springhead Gardens development as a precedent. However, that site did not involve coal extraction or proximity to existing homes. In contrast, this application involves extraction close to residential areas and public paths. The reference is irrelevant and misleading.</p> <p>In fact, on the date of previous refusal of this same application, the supreme court make a costly ruling against Surrey local authority for failing to adequately assess the impact of such coal extraction which, in fact, sets a precedent resulting in such coal extraction next to residential homes illegal.</p> <p>3. Unsuitability of Land for Development The proposal contradicts UK and local policies designed to protect public safety, the environment, and local businesses. The site sits in the heart of a village, surrounded by homes and paths used by schoolchildren. Properties adjacent to the site are already experiencing movement—before any mining has begun.</p> <p>Key concerns same in this and previous submissions of this application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Impact of open cast coal extraction covering over 4,500m<sup>2</sup>, yielding 4,150m<sup>3</sup> of coal in heart of a village in close proximity to residential houses and paths children use to get to school. Not clear how coal will be used - contravenes national policy. Lack of clear assessment of impact on people's health and local residents</li></ul>	

clear assessment of impact on people's health and local residents.

- Unacceptable number of HGV loads (one of key reasons for refusal last time) causing pollution, impact on small village roads and traffic measures that would impact the main access route into the village - impacting local businesses.
- 550 additional drill sites for concrete injection.
- Lack of required assessments: no Remediation Risk Assessment, Coal Extraction Plan, or Grouting Operations Plan.
- Continued unacceptable high volume of lorry movements, disrupting local businesses and traffic.
- Air Pollution: Coal dust and diesel emissions (PM10, PM2.5, NO2) linked to asthma, heart disease, and premature death.
- Noise Pollution: Long-term industrial noise affecting stress and sleep.
- Mental Health: Loss of green space and disruption to daily life would reduce community wellbeing.
- Proposal conflicts with climate goals and Kirklees Council's declared climate emergency.
- Impact on local wildlife, bats, rare birds, and its location next to paths children use to get to school, and to access nearby public footpaths and walks.

#### 4. Flood Risk

A chartered RICS surveyor raised concerns in a report I commissioned notes a nearby stream and flood risk if this land was developed behind existing homes, warning that development could raise the water table and increase surface flooding risk. He states in the report that:

"that there is a small stream beyond the rear boundary. This is at a lower level than the house. I am concerned that when the new development is built, this may increase the height of the water table, and this may lead to surface water flooding beyond the rear boundary. This should be given due consideration by the Local Authority when determining the planning application."

The coal seam extraction and remedial works pumping the hill with concrete further heightens this risk.

On informing the surveyor of the coal seam and previously rejected plans they were unaware of, whilst not in the report, they shared what a ridiculous thing they thought that would be to even consider, in terms of impact and also cost.

#### 5. Health & Environmental Impact

The development would significantly harm local health and wellbeing:

- Air Pollution: Coal dust and diesel emissions (PM10, PM2.5, NO2) linked to asthma, heart disease, and premature death.
- Noise Pollution: Long-term industrial noise affecting stress and sleep.
- Mental Health: Loss of green space and disruption to daily life would reduce community wellbeing.
- The proposal conflicts with climate goals and Kirklees Council's declared climate emergency.

## 6. Overbearing Design

The 21 metre rule referred to in the application is guidance for the minimum to consider, and applies to like for like homes. Three-story homes built on steep terrain would dominate and overlook neighbouring two-story properties below it, reducing privacy and natural light. This would negatively impact residents' mental health and quality of life.

## 7. Local Plan and Alternative Sites

This part of site HS144 is unsuitable and unnecessary for development:

- A new brownfield site at Greenside Mills has come forward, providing 46 homes.
- Other safer, non-coal-bearing land is available.

This land should be reclassified as Urban Green Space in the local plan review and enhanced with tree and shrub planting, saving public resources and preventing further unsuitable applications.