

## 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
<p>Objection – Planning Application 2025/62/91370/W Site: Land at Gynn Lane, Honley Proposal: Construction of 50 dwellings with associated access and infrastructure. I wish to strongly object to this application, particularly regarding the highway safety conclusions presented in the applicant's Highway Technical Note prepared by Via Solutions Ltd.</p> <p>1. The Applicant's Own Evidence Confirms Gynn Lane Is Substandard The technical note confirms that: The carriageway width is 5.2–5.5 m The existing footway width is only 0.9–1.3 m These dimensions fall below modern design guidance in the Manual for Streets for a residential route expected to accommodate pedestrians, vehicles, and service traffic. The applicant themselves acknowledges that the existing highway and footway widths do not meet current design standards. Rather than resolving this deficiency, the rebuttal argues that widening should not occur due to cost and environmental constraints. This is not an appropriate planning justification. If safe access requires improvements, the correct conclusion is that the development is unsuitable for the site, not that necessary improvements should be avoided.</p> <p>2. Safety Risks Are Likely to Increase With Additional Traffic The technical note states that current peak flows are approximately 73 vehicles per hour (just over one vehicle per minute). However, the development proposes 50 dwellings, which could generate approximately 300–400 additional daily vehicle movements based on standard residential trip rates. This represents a substantial increase in traffic on a narrow rural lane with substandard pedestrian facilities. The developer's argument that the road is currently safe does not demonstrate that it will remain safe once a significant new housing development is introduced.</p> <p>3. Pedestrian Surveys Underestimate Real Usage The applicant's survey suggests 10–14 pedestrians during peak hours along the</p>	

The applicant's survey suggests 13–14 pedestrians during peak hours along the footway north of the site.

However, the survey location appears limited to a single point and may not fully capture:

- School-related pedestrian movements toward Honley High School
- Walking routes between Honley railway station and surrounding residential areas
- Recreational walking in this semi-rural area

Furthermore, a footway width of under 1 m is clearly inadequate for safe pedestrian movement, particularly where parents with children, pushchairs, or mobility users may be present.

#### 4. Refusal to Deliver Requested Highway Improvements

The Highway Technical Note states that the improvements requested by Kirklees Council (including a 2 m footway and carriageway widening) would require watercourse diversion and cost approximately £750,000.

The developer therefore proposes a reduced level of improvement.

This effectively means the development would proceed without the highway upgrades that the highway authority initially considered necessary to mitigate the impact. Cost to the developer should not outweigh public safety considerations.

#### 5. Visibility and Road Geometry Concerns

Although the report states visibility splays meet requirements based on measured vehicle speeds ( $\approx 28$ – $29.5$  mph), the site lies on a bend in Gynn Lane.

Real-world conditions such as:

- parked vehicles
- agricultural traffic
- cyclists
- seasonal vegetation

can all significantly reduce practical visibility and increase collision risk.

#### 6. Cumulative Impact on Local Highway Network

Additional traffic from the development will ultimately feed onto A616 road, where congestion already occurs during peak periods.

The application does not adequately assess the cumulative impact of this additional traffic on the wider network.

#### Conclusion

The applicant's own highway evidence demonstrates that:

- Gynn Lane already operates below modern highway design standards
- Pedestrian facilities are substandard
- Necessary highway improvements have been reduced due to cost and environmental constraints

Allowing a 50-dwelling development in these circumstances would place additional traffic onto an inadequate rural lane with limited pedestrian provision, creating unacceptable highway safety risks.

For these reasons, planning permission should be refused.