Address: 30-32 Lumb Lane Huddersfield HD46SZ

About the application

Application number: 2024/93494	
What is the application for?:	(amended plans) Erection of restaurant/café/bar, six guest rooms, exhibition/int
Address of the site or building:	Victoria Tower, Castle Hill, Lumb Lane, Almondbury, Huddersfield, HD4 6TA
Postcode:	

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	No

Regarding application number 2024/93494 at location Victoria Tower, Castle Hill, Lumb Lane, Almondbury, Huddersfield, HD4 6TA
I wish to register my objection to the development at Victoria Tower, Castle Hill planning reference 2024/93494 The latest submission is stated to be a revision of the concept developed under the previous expired application (2018/93591) with new proposals that incorporate the revisions and additions made whilst trying to make a bad scheme workable. Most notable of these are an extended car park, introduction of a large gated service yard, and an apparent adjustment of the building's position northwards on site in order to accommodate the extra parking. All of which would have a more damaging impact on the site, physically and in how it is perceived. It also appears that the newly submitted scheme has not addressed important issues raised by Historic England throughout the previous application.

I have lived on Lumb Lane for over twenty years. In all that time Castle Hill has been a valuable local community asset supporting physical and mental well-being as well as serving the wider community of hikers, dog walkers and providing welcome green space for Huddersfield residents and children.
It has served well in this capacity despite the failed attempt at development by the same group now attempting to build on the site yet again after failing to comply with previous planning restrictions.
I object in the strongest terms to the latest revised application as it will have a significant ecological impact on the hill, diminish the ancient monument and the area around (in terms of traffic volumes and roadside parking). For example, the new plan unfortunately includes an enlarged site taking in land closer to the tower (owned by Kirklees not the applicant), a larger building encroaching further into the hillfort embankments around the inner and outer Bailey and paving over existing green space by suggesting carparking with charging points be enlarged by 50%. Can we please avoid paving over green space and aspire to reduce car use and increase support for walkers and cyclists?
This still begs interesting questions as none of this revised development is in the interest of current users of this ancient site nor does it respect the historical importance of the listed monument and surrounding. In an era of council supported green space, mental health initiatives and tree planting is this revised application still driven more by income generation and greed than service to the community?