

## DC Admin

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 24 July 2025 22:44  
**To:** DC Admin  
**Subject:** Objection to planning application 2025/62/91370/W: 50 houses on Gynn Lane

**CAUTION:** External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good evening,

I have just submitted my comments onto the planning portal but it came through with lots of formatting errors (</br>), where I have added in a new line. For this reason I've also attached it to this email.

Please can this be submitted as an objection and be submitted anonymously?

Many thanks,

I write to formally object to this application (2025/91370) for the following reasons, which are contrary to the Kirklees Local Plan and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). My concerns are grouped under relevant policy areas:

### 1. Highway Safety and Access (LP20, LP21)

- Gynn Lane is narrow and has a number blind bends, with narrow footways for pedestrians. In places further up Hall Ing Lane, there is also a complete lack of footways. Increased traffic from 50 homes would pose risks to pedestrians, including children accessing Honley High School.
- Visibility splays at the access point are inadequate due to boundary features and road geometry. Even with the removal of some vegetation, this access point comes after corners with poor visibility in both directions, where cars are often travelling at speed.
- The Transport Assessment estimates 50 total journeys per day to and from the site, adding to an already congested lane during peak hours such as school drop-off and pick-up times.
- The new works to the bottom of Gynn Lane have moved the parked cars further up the lane. When cars park on both sides, as well as near the blind bend at cottages 30/32, traffic is reduced to a single lane, causing congestion. The additional vehicles will only add to this. There is a risk where children cross the road between parked cars on these blind and tricky bends, and so it seems irresponsible to add additional traffic in these areas.
- Additional highways reports should be taken to assess the traffic situation at peak times to get a more realistic view on the traffic around the site and on the lane. These should be conducted when the schools are back, opposed to during the school holidays.

### 2. Flood Risk and Drainage (LP27, LP28)

- Ludhill Dike borders the site and is vulnerable to increased runoff.

- The Flood Risk Assessment identifies surface water flow paths at risk of flooding.
- Attenuation capacity may be insufficient in an upland area with a history of heavy rainfall.
- Gynn Lane has already had multiple floods at the bottom of the lane, with residents properties being flooded, and this is before the permeable site is built on with a hard standing, non-permeable surface for roads and housing. The houses and community below the proposed development site are at further risk of being flooded by surface water run-off.

Chapter 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):

Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

A number of residents have to maintain additional drains and culverts not listed on the developers flood report/plans to avoid further flooding. The additional hard surfacing will only add the issue at the bottom of Gynn Lane. It would seem sensible to include all of the culverts in the nearby area when taking the drainage requirements & flood precautions into account, as many of these attribute to the amount of water entering Ludhill Dike.

### 3. Biodiversity and Habitat Loss (LP30, NPPF §179–182)

- The River Condition Assessment ranks Ludhill Dike as "Fairly Poor". The development risks further degradation of the dike.
- Biodiversity Net Gain relies on off-site mitigation, which is less certain and fails to fully offset on-site losses.

### 4. Trees and Landscape Impact (LP24, LP33)

- Significant trees along boundaries and near the dike are being lost. These contribute to local character, biodiversity, and screening. Their removal is unjustified.
- The visual impact on the Honley valley is severe due to elevated site levels.

### 5. Neighbour Amenity and Overdevelopment (LP24, LP52)

- Proximity to neighbouring properties would lead to overlooking, noise, and visual intrusion.
- The site layout places 2.5-storey dwellings on rising ground, affecting views and privacy.

### 6. Unsuitable Design and Integration (LP1, LP7, LP24)

- The cul-de-sac layout is suburban and poorly integrated with Honley's settlement pattern.
- The scheme does not reflect local materials or architectural form, contrary to local design principles.

### 7. Coal Mining Legacy and Ground Stability (LP53, NPPF §183)

- The Coal Authority identifies the site as within a High Risk area.
- Mine shafts and shallow workings require further investigation and remediation. It has been reported that during the initial drilling, residents gardens on Marsh Platt Lane were flooded due to the release of water from the mines.

### 8. Infrastructure and Cumulative Impact (LP47, LP63)

- No confirmed school or healthcare capacity for new residents.
- No measures proposed to enhance local transport, active travel, or community services.
- Gynn Lane, Hall Ing Lane and the streets that branch off them, have around 150 houses currently. This new development would increase it by an additional third, putting further strain on the local community services.
- It is noted that the pedestrian access it to be on Marsh Platt Lane, but for those using the train station, pedestrians are likely to use the entrance on Gynn Lane. The proposed crossing point is placed in a tight area, causing concern for pedestrians using it.
- The section of road before the railway bridge and beyond, towards Hall Ing Lane, has a single pathway and is used by residents further up the lane. There are many residents who are elderly, and

several suffer from illnesses such as Alzheimer's and use this section of road for their daily exercise. To increase traffic in this area would result in these residents losing the ability for daily exercise and a safe access to the Village.

This proposal is unsustainable, harmful to public safety, and damaging to local character and biodiversity. It is contrary to several adopted policies within the Kirklees Local Plan. I would request that this application be refused.