About the application

Application number: 2025/92440	
What is the application for?:	Erection of four dwellings
Address of the site or building:	Lumb Lane Nurseries, Lumb Lane, Almondbury, Huddersfield, HD4 6SZ
Postcode:	HD4 6SZ

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	Yes

I do not support this application, which has already been changed mid application since its initial submission.

The area is of great historic significance and the proposals are not sympathetic to the surrounding listed properties.

Due to the high elevations proposed the development will overwhelm the surrounding residences and impact on the ability for those in Kirklees to enjoy the open unspoilt countryside in the valley, already an area of outstanding beauty in the lea of Castle Hill, an iconic Kirklees monument.

The proposed development is situated within the green belt of the valley and therefore does not comply with the national planning framework guidelines for development under the auspices of claiming it to be grey belt.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) para. 147 states that inappropriate development in the green belt is by definition harmful and should only be approved in special circumstances - this development shows no such special circumstances exist, it instead reduces the openness and encroaches into the countryside.

The site itself has not been classified as grey belt and therefore does not satisfy the requirements of NPPF 154g, 155 and 203f and should not claim to be classified as such.

The lane is already narrow and yet subject to significant amounts of traffic on a daily basis, there having been a number of road traffic accidents in recent years.

With further development proposals for Castle Hill having been approved the amount of traffic will already increase significantly and the addition of four dwellings will contribute negatively to the issue of safe traffic management and pedestrian use of the lane.

The proposals are contrary to Local Planning Policy (LP21) as increased traffic will worsen conditions for vehicles, horse riders, pedestrians and cyclists.

The proposed development does not allow enough space for visiting vehicles and any further parking on the lane itself will be dangerous to other vehicle users, horse riders, cyclists and pedestrians. The lane is also used extensively for agricultural vehicular movements supporting a number of farming interests in the valley.

The reports submitted regarding net biodiversity gain do not show a significant gain (if any!), the best net gain would be to keep the site for agricultural purposes and its return to such use should be a significant driver for what should happen to this site.

I refer to NPPF 179 and LP30 requirements to increase biodiversity and secure measurable net gain - neither of which are achieved with this development.

The proposal for four dwellings does not create a material or meaningful quantity of new housing to support Kirklees's Local Plan.

The latest revised plans - again submitted mid way through a planning consultation period (which surely should be a withdrawl of the original application and a new application being required to be submitted) have not been subject to consultations with local residents greatly impacted by the proposed development as claimed in the planning application.

What else is claimed in the application that is not factually correct?

Are all the applicants supporting reports, which were submitted for the initial development for five properties, still relevant and correct for what is a fundamentally a different scheme in this resubmission?

The impact on Yew Croft will be significant and impede light to the property, significantly reduce the privacy (the proposed three semi-detached properties will look directly into children's bedrooms and bathrooms) at the property and there will be noise implications to the elderly residents in the surrounding properties.

The three semi detached properties will look directly into the garden of Yew Croft and will overwhelm the driveway and impact on views of the valley. Instead of living in the countryside Yew Croft will feel as if it is part of a modern housing development not in keeping with the heritage of 19th century Georgian architecture.

The proposed development does not appear to be built with materials that are in keeping with other would be adjacent properties, some of which are listed. They are completely out of character and detract from the natural beauty of the Woodsome Valley.

At what point does development stop within the, or curtilage of, agricultural green belt land?

I would strongly recommend that this application be refused.