Address: 24 Sharp Lane Huddersfield HD4 6SW

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?	No

I strongly object to the proposed development:

Lumb Lane is a peaceful, quiet, largely rural area of the Woodsome Valley; it is highly sensitive for several reasons. The buildings fall mostly between 1750-1900 and their architecture reflects the importance of agriculture and cloth industry. There are 12 (or more) Grade 2 listed buildings along the 'stretch' close to the Nursery site, along with Fletcher House Farm which dates from the C15th (or earlier, date range=C1300-1500) and is currently under review to be upgraded to 2 * listing due to its rarity as an unaisled Yeoman house.
Only 1 building on this 'stretch' has been built later than the 19th century which replaced a previous building.
The dwellings are uniform in their use of stone and slate.
Lumb Lane is a country lane, narrow, mostly unlit and without white lines. There is no pavement at all for much of the lane, and only a single, haphazard, area of (broken, random) paving in one small section.
The last local plan designated the Woodsome Valley as an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, however, the criteria have changed but little in the locale is any different. Along with this, the proposed scheme sits closely to the recently designated wildlife corridor with the White Rose tree planting scheme is due to start Autumn 2025, reinforcing woodland habitats in the valley. This site is home to Bats and House martins, amongst other precious, rare and special creatures.
The proposed scheme would 'close off' the natural environment, remove space between the heritage assets which currently give a distinct context to the clusters of characterful buildings.
The site itself was allotments during the war years and up until the 1970's. It then became a small scale nursery. The nursery was not a commercial enterprise and.as such, did not sell plants to the public, it simply 'grew plants on' for wholesale use. There was no 'shop'. It was simply one delivery van and the owner's small car parked by day, Monday to Friday. There have never been '9 parking spaces' (why would they be required, it was not open to the public??) as has been suggested. All buildings are of a temporary nature and the site has not been previously developed.

of a temporary nature and the site has not been previously developed.
The current proposal mis-represents the site and its previous use.
If the Planning Commitee so desires, a short conversation with the ex site owner would verify this as fact.

Clearly, the proposed scheme is situated within 'green belt' and does not comply with current guidelines for development.
'Grey belt' status does not apply to the site as it has only ever housed temporary structures. which should preclude this development. The size and scale of the proposed dwellings is alien and completely out of character for the area constituting overdevelopment. In short, it would 'stick out' like the proverbial sore thumb. It would, without doubt, increase light pollution and noise for current residents.
Aside from aesthetics, the creation of 10+ (?) parking spaces on this modest sized plot would not only increase the building footprint very considerably but also the area of 'sealed surface' by creating driveways- far from ideal, to say the least.
Overall traffic volume on this narrow lane would increase significantly; at present there are roughly 12 resident vehicles in total from number 40 Lumb Lane to Fletcher House Farm entrance (mostly parked off road)- the proposed scheme would, at least, double that figure. As previously stated, the lane is very narrow, mostly 'unlit' and generally without pavement; the impact on the safety of pedestrians, cyclists, horse + rider and vehicular users of the lane is of huge concern, along with this, access/exiting the proposed site is fraught with difficulties, being at one of the narrowest parts of Lumb Lane; the site was never intended, or conducive to being a residential development.

In view of all of the above considered comments, i respectfully ask that the Planning Committee refuses this application.