About the application

Application number: 2025/91370	
What is the application for?:	REVISED AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RECEIVED: Demolition of existing dwelling and
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

2025/91370
Far from resolving issues and questions arising from the first submission, the revised submission raises additional questions and issues.
Ecology - Viability Report para 2.7 states that access to the retained adjoining woodland is incorporated in the plans. This is likely to be because a satisfactory public area cannot be created elsewhere. This is unacceptable for the wildlife in the vicinity and it is likely that mining has occurred in the wood. If the railway is part of the wildlife habitable network, so is this wood. Also, this proposal would increase the bio-diversity net loss.
The impression is given that the rookery is in decline. It is not. On 8/3/26 twenty nests were under construction.
Waste Management - In the original submission No. 34 was to be demolished to achieve the necessary access to the site. Viability Report para. 1.2 says that the house will be retained. The implication being that access for bin waggons is not possible. However, it is stated that Kirklees Council has agreed to go on site to empty bins on a road that is not adopted. However, Kirklees does not say this in the documentation submitted.
In the future the assumption is that householders will take their bins to a collection point in the woodland on a level with Gynn Lane. This is impractical as this point is more than 25 metres from properties.
Unadopted road - It is anticipated that when the road needs extensive repair Kirklees Council would adopt it. As a Council Taxpayer, I object to this as Kirklees cannot maintain roads in the area now and should not be pushed into taking on additional sub-standard roads.
Management Company - It is now proposed that it is responsible for the woodland, the maintenance of the open section of the watercourse on site and the maintenance of the unadopted road. Who would take responsibility for these and what would be enforceable should the company go into liquidation?
Abnormal Costs -These are now £2,018,074 and are to be covered by:
Not having a pavement or crossing to ensure the safety of pedestrians (including a notional 16 children).
A reduction in the number of affordable units.
Culverting Ludhill Dike rather than constructing a bridge. Whilst the Environment Agency is not opposed to the development it does defer to the Lead Local Flood Authority for comments in relation to the proposed culverting of the Dike.
Not constructing the road on the development to an adoptable standard.
These are unacceptable proposals arising from a non-viable site that Holme Valley Parish Council opposed in the first instance.