About the application

Application number: 2025/91370	
What is the application for?:	Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 50 dwellings with associated acc
Address of the site or building:	Land at, Gynn Lane, Honley, Holmfirth, HD9 6LF
Postcode:	

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	Yes

My objections are as follows:

1. Inadequate Access and Highway Safety

The proposed access point for the development opens onto a narrow part of Gynn Lane, just after a railway bridge, and just before a blind bend. There are no pavements on the side of the road with the proposed access (and if one is to be created it will make an already narrow and dangerous road even narrower), and the additional volume of traffic created by this new development will mean that the site access is both dangerous, and will create further congestion in an already narrow and congested area.

Particularly at school drop off and pick up times, there are multiple cars parked on Gynn Lane every day making exiting onto new mill road difficult and a major new housing development with its increased traffic volume will only increase this problem.

Our children walk along this road, and I cannot understand how allowing a development that will result in a significant number of cars turning in and out of a narrow road on a blind bend where they cross the road is either safe or justified. This is a real concern for all residents snd must be viewed in person to be fully appreciated as the plans do not show the full extent of the difficulties in driving this section of road at present.

The proposed access is therefore unsuitable for a site of this scale, and renders the site unsustainable in transport terms and contrary to local and national planning policies aimed at ensuring safe and suitable access for all users.

2. Loss of Protected Woodland

In addition to the dangerous nature of the access, creating it requires the removal of protected woodland, which is not only an environmental concern, but also a loss of valuable public amenity and biodiversity. Such loss is unjustified and cannot be

valuable public amenity and biodiversity. Such loss is unjustified and cannot be adequately mitigated or compensated for on-site.

3. Undermining from Historic Mine Workings / Flooding Issues

The site lies above historic mine workings, which presents considerable geotechnical risks. I know that exploratory ground works have already disturbed mine water on the North West boundary of the proposed development site which flooded several nearby properties, and we see no safeguards to prevent the much more invasive development works from creating far more serious flooding issues.

Moreover, the area downstream from the site has a well documented history of flooding (which even without this development appear incapable of being fixed), and our concern is that a development of this scale is likely to worsen surface water runoff, and release water trapped in historic mine workings making future flood events significantly more frequent and costly.

The removal of woodland and permeable land increases this risk further still.

Unless robust and independently verified flood mitigation measures are included, the development is contrary to NPPF guidance on managing flood risk.

4. Destruction of Heritage Assets

The proposed development would cause the destruction of heritage assets described as being “of considerable significance” in advice the Council received from Farrell & Clark. Moreover, the proposed development ignores the strong objections from Historic England. What is the justification for ignoring the advice of the Council’s own independent consultants, and Historic England?

5. Footpath onto Marsh Platt Lane

The proposal appears to include a footpath down on to Marsh Platt Lane. This is a narrow, private and unadopted road, which has no council maintenance, with a significant retaining wall (over 3 metres high) preventing the site from falling into Marsh Platt Lane.

This access point therefore is unsuitable for a development of this scale, and without very significant structural work, there is a risk that this retaining wall collapses into Marsh Platt Lane.

What structural and other surveys have been conducted to ensure this is both safe and viable? We can see no evidence on this part. Again this must be viewed in person to appreciate the scale of the wall in question.

Conclusion
This proposal is contrary to key national and local planning policies relating to environmental protection, transport and access, flood risk and heritage conservation.

Given the scale and seriousness of these objections, I urge the council to refuse this

planning application.