

## 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?	Yes
<p>I wish to strongly object. The proposal is still for a coal mine!</p> <p>In addition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- FLOOD RISK The application form still says the scheme will not increase flood risk, but about one fifth of the road area will discharge surface water onto Cumberworth Lane which already runs like a river in heavy rain, as does Wakefield Road further on. The drains here are already failing. There are no details of the 'attenuation tank', and the calculations do not seem to address changing patterns of rainfall due to climate change.</li><li>- The outflow from the attenuation tank now goes into the existing 'water course' not sewers, but this is a seasonal ditch, which has recently been culverted under the Springhead Gardens access road (was allowance made here for additional through-flow?), and may well be the same culvert beneath Old School Court, with a right-angle bend which blocked &amp; caused flooding here and in the library car park unless repaired. Does this culvert have capacity?</li><li>- Every effort will need to be made to prevent material falling into or being washed into this watercourse during construction works especially of the tank. (This unfortunately happened at Old School Court, necessitating extensive repairs to the culvert). This risk and how to avoid it is not mentioned.</li><li>- The water is shown to flow out through a 'headwall and trash screen' – who will be responsible for this long-term? Who will keep it cleared, running free and make sure it is safely fixed &amp; in good order?</li><li>- The culvert sections are purely notional – not based on site survey. This culvert/ditch leads off our land and we have noticed an increase in flooding here (identified as a Flood Risk on authority maps) since other new housing has been built downhill. There are probably other springs on the land – there are certainly large drain pipes of unknown origin &amp; purpose crossing our land above the site.</li><li>- ECOLOGY - the application form now says that no priority or protected species exist (amended from previous which said they did exist but not on THIS land, only on surrounding land). This is nonsense. Bats, owls, newts and others use the whole area.</li><li>- The Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment is a disaster – nearly all the site is to be developed! The Post-development plan shows the area of vegetated land left after the scheme is very small – about 20% by eye? This completely fails to meet the standards</li></ul>	

scheme is very small – about 20% by eye? This completely fails to meet the standards expected by Kirklees.

- There is no attempt to create green corridors to replace the lines of hedgerows and scrub/trees that will be swept away. These link the site to habitats beyond including eventually Wither Wood, creating much more valuable habitat for our declining 'common' wildlife. Small isolated islands are much less use.

- A wiggly footpath is placed within the root zone of the TPO Oak tree – will cause damage to the tree – why here? This is not on the 'desire line' it is just a fancy and will cause unnecessary disturbance to the TPO tree's roots.

- The landscape plan says that previous tipping here will be removed – but it is hard to understand this from the architect's drawings.

- BOUNDARY TREATMENTS – there is an opportunity to use materials and styles typical of the area – repairing stone walls and enhancing & creating hedgerows. This is not taken – the materials used are very urban.

- ROAD TRAFFIC This density & type of development places extra pressure of car use – 93 extra cars given number of parking spaces. The Travel Plan is just providing information – there is still no proposal to create a safe junction. The application ignores the speed and frequency of existing traffic, which I encounter whenever I cross the road here, several times a week (used to be every working day, 4 times per day)

- PUBLIC OPEN SPACE - the only areas designated as POS are either undevelopable (under mature Oak tree & over tank; or small infill planting beds. There is no space for informal outdoor play by children living in these new houses, except in the streets. There is little provision nearby – what there was on Leak Hall Crescent has already been built on.

- RETAINING WALLS – the scheme requires very high retaining walls, especially across the middle of the site, with houses perched very close above the wall. What is the long-term position of maintenance responsibility for these walls, and who will enforce that – especially given the instability of the ground. What foundations will these walls require? Due to the extent of excavation required, it would seem possible to re-shape the site to avoid these walls, for a better environment, lower long-term risk and lower costs.