DC Admin

Sent: 26 March 2026 22:24
To: DC Admin
Subject: Objection to application number: 2025/91370

I wish to add an objection to the planning application number: 2025/91370 REVISED AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RECEIVED: Demolition of existing dwelling and Land at, Gynn Lane, Honley, Holmfirth, HD9 6LF

--

I am writing to object to this development, and I am commenting for the second time to follow up on my previous objection.

Further investigation needs to be undertaken in a number of areas, as demonstrated by the various authorities/bodies responding to the updated request for comment, whereby they state that there has been no update or change.

The Environment agency have concerns re the potential impact of altering the watercourse, in their words "We note that the proposed development involves culverting an ordinary watercourse. We are generally opposed to culverting watercourses due to the detrimental impacts on flood risk and the environment, and therefore recommend that the applicant considers a clear span bridge rather than a culvert." – regardless of whether a clear span bridge or a culvert is created, there are clear concerns from both agencies and residents in regards to flood risks down Gynn Lane, Marsh Platt Lane and the field at the bottom (which continues to flood in heavy rainfall, without any changes to the current watercourse and despite the roadwork alterations to the bottom of Gynn Lane). The proposed development in itself would have hardstanding ground and solid surfaces (buildings) that do not currently exist, and so in adding these there is a real concern for those properties to the foot of the hill, who have already experienced flooding from the prior investigations on the site (in relation to this application), whilst the ground isn't hardstanding.

There have been a number of unreported floods along the lane, whereby properties along Gynn Lane have had experienced minor floods at the bottom of their own properties where a watercourse / culvert is located. These will not have been taken into account or cannot have been included in the research undertaken by the applicant as this is local knowledge shared by residents (as it is the residents who look after these courses themselves).

It would appear from the updated application, that annotations and notes have been superseded, or redacted to the clients request, which as a resident causes concern as to what is being hidden. The Public Health letter also shares this in that they haven't had an adequate response to their concerns. There seems to be a general lack of investigations undertaken to ensure that this site is appropriate (also considering the work proposed adjacent to the railway boundary, historic mines and the watercourse).

The local area is teeming with wildlife, whether that's bats, deers, rooks, ducks and other birds. The works to this site would not only destroy some of their habitats, but disrupt their way of life and harm something that is so

valuable to so many people in the local area. The rookery in itself is thriving – it has been a pleasure to watch them build their nests and to think that their habitat could be destroyed is unthinkable. The wildlife has been here for generations, and to think that this would disappear for the sake of 50 houses (many of which are unaffordable), it is a real shame for the rural area and green spaces that we are so lucky to have. Surely there are more suitable spaces to be developed upon for such houses, that not impact natural landscapes.

The comments relating to affordable housing requirements have not been addressed, and the latest statement re the refuge collection shows that there has been no update (the previous statement from the refuge department stated that there were only spaces allocated for two bins, and some of the distances to take these out are deemed inadequate). There are updated plans, but some show space for two bins, and some for three. If Kirklees do adopt the bin policy of four bins per household for further recycling, this needs to be taken into consideration too.

Overall, as a local resident, I strongly object to this development.