18 C The Maltings Gynn Lane Honey HD9 6LF

Planning application 2025/62/91370/W

Objection

I have three objections to the development proposal.

First, this proposal is in breach of both National Planning Framework guidelines (paras 170-174) and Kirklees Local Plan guidelines for new housing allocations (para 4.2) Both state new housing developments should not increase flood risk to existing property. This application is a serious flood risk for existing property, driven by potential disturbance and unsettlement of existing underground springs and the impact on unstable mine workings (identified by the Coal Authority as Development High Risk)

My house, which lies below the site, has been flooded twice from water disturbed by site investigations. The first, documented by Lithos on 2 August 2024, was caused by disturbance by Lithos of mine ochre in the existing mine shaft. The second, on February 8th 2026, followed on from the excavation by Haigh/Huddleston of a trial trench on 15th January.



I incurred costs to remove the blockage from drainage pipes which take spring water running through the mine workings past my and my neighbours houses from 15-18c Gynn Lane. The drainage company identified the blockage as deposits loosened during the investigative work on the site. I have lived in my house for 16 years, and these are the only two flooding incidents in that time. Both are related to site investigations which have disturbed earth in the field proposed for development. How will we fare when foundations are being laid? The suggestions by the technical report paid for by Vivily that an “eye is kept on the impact to local property” during proposed works, is both ludicrous and insulting. The report does not address the concerns of the Kirklees Local Flood Manager. Kirklees Council should not allow development of this part of the site unless guarantees can be given that local and national guidelines to prevent damage to property have been met in full.

Second, serious concerns raised by Kirklees Highways to promote the safety of pedestrians have been wholly ignored as impractical. A safe pavement cannot be laid without ecological damage. And the proposed compromise risks public safety. Visa Solutions make clear cars travelling at logged average speeds cannot stop in time to avoid collision. They suggest the risk is small because current pedestrian flows are light. But this does not take into account footfall from the site, nor the devastating impact should a fatal collision occur. Can this sort of compromise really be sanctioned?

Third, the revised planning application fails to meet the information required from KC Landscape, KC Trees, KC Ecology, and still has not met the requirements set out by the

KC lead Flood Manager, and KC Highways in relation to refuse collection and removal. The reports produced in commercial arrangements with the developer are largely well short of the information the Planning Committee requires to make a decision in the best interests of residents, now and in the future. It should be refused.