

DC Admin

From:
Sent: 12 February 2026 16:12
To: DC Admin
Subject: 2025/91770 - objection
Attachments: Planning objection letter 260210.docx

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

Good afternoon

Please find attached my objection to the above application.

The Highways department commented on 14/1/26 (after closure for public consultation) and part of my response is drafted in consideration of their document. I trust it will therefore be considered despite the consultation being closed for further responses.

I consent for my comments to be published anonymously.

Kind regards

Please anonymise for online publication.

I object to the planning application. I have read the public objection (id 1117331 / 9/12/25) and whole heartedly agree with its contents. In addition, I would like to add the following:

1. Ownership of the land is unclear. The application states (page 12) that the applicant is not the sole owner of all the land to which the application relates and that the applicant cannot (and therefore presumably has not) given notice to all other owners. The only attempt to identify land owners appears to have been a single notice in the Examiner in June 2025. This is inadequate.
2. Access to Station Road. The highways authority are “pleased to see” that the red line boundary now extends to the adopted highway (Huddersfield Road) but this cannot be right given the application is on the basis that the applicant does not own (all of) the relevant land. The access to Station Road is not passable for two cars side-by-side, which is dangerous, given Huddersfield Road has a 40mph limit. Adding five homes of the proposed size will add between 10 – 15 additional vehicles as standard, plus all service and delivery vehicles which increases the danger beyond an acceptable level. I am very surprised that the highways authority have approved the access despite their previous clear and proper concern.

3. Access bridge. The highways response has noted that the bridge has never been structurally assessed. It is proposed that the developer would need to contact the bridge owner for permission to use the bridge prior to accessing the site. It is submitted that the Council (planning authority and with overarching responsibility for the safety of Kirklees residents) must go further than highlight the relevant permissions required, and must request a full assessment of the structural integrity of the bridge prior to permission being granted. Failure to do so may result in catastrophic failure of the bridge to the detriment of residents of Station Road, together with potential disruption to local businesses. Any such impact to the bridge would prevent emergency service vehicles from accessing homes.
4. The application states there are no trees on land adjacent to the proposed development site that could influence the development or might be important as part of the local landscape character. This is plainly untrue. The adjacent land is surrounded by TPO areas and runs adjacent to the greenway. One of the initial responses from the council was a holding objection on this basis due to the absence of information. This has not yet been rectified and no further information has been given. There are a number of issues highlighted from an ecology perspective.
5. Flood risk to adjacent properties. I am very concerned that the local lead flood authority considered there was a “high risk” of re-emergence of surface water in third party land below the development. Yet the proposed solutions to the problem are both “temporary” and inaccurate – the updated flood response shows the calculations to be incorrect. This is a major safety hazard to neighbouring homes and the surrounding landscape.
6. Structural stability of the retaining wall. The proposed site sits much higher than the existing homes and road level of Station Road. Many of the existing homes rely on the structure of the natural stone (presumed sandstone) to act as a retaining wall against the

land above. I am very concerned that excavating and disruption to the land above may cause movement of the retained earth (held by the natural retaining wall). The access road to the proposed homes sits at the very top of the banking, running dangerously close to the edge, and will therefore impact the structural stability of the ground below. The planning officers are invited to attend Station Road and inspect the land and natural retaining wall to visualise the real risk this poses to existing residents.

7. Residential disruption. The proposed layout of the homes unacceptably interferes with neighbouring residents' privacy. I urge the planning team to attend in person and visit the site to really appreciate the magnitude of the impact to residents and the landscape that will occur if this application is granted. This is clear overdevelopment of land and it cannot be presented as meeting the need for additional affordable housing given the size and therefore price of the proposed homes. In short, this application should be refused.