

To: louise.bearcroft@kirklees.gov.uk; louisebearcroft@kirklees.gov.uk

Sent: Wednesday, October 29th 2025, 14:32

Subject: Application No: 2025/44/92737/E - Objection to Planning Application –
Development to the Rear of 23–43 Moor Lane

Dear Louise

I would like to register my objection & concerns relating to the proposed development to the rear of 23–43 Moor Lane, on the following grounds.

The revised planning application shows significant alterations to both the drainage strategy and the flood risk management arrangements compared to the previously approved scheme. These changes raise serious concerns regarding the suitability and long-term reliability of the proposed system.

When the original consent was granted, one of the major issues that required careful resolution was the site's drainage. The only acceptable solution at that time residents were told was for foul water to be pumped back up to the top of the site and surface water to be drained via a pipe installed in the ground under the garden of 41 Moor Lane to connect to the mains on Moor Lane. The new application, however, replaces this with a crate-based soakaway system for surface water which combines with foul water to both drain back onto Moor Lane, which appears to be a considerable departure from the previously approved approach.

Combined Surface and Foul Water Systems

The original scheme proposed two distinct systems, with foul water being pumped back up the site, which was a more robust and appropriate design for this location. Surely combining both systems risks overloading the network, particularly during heavy rainfall?

Drainage Levels and Pipe Gradients

The proposed drainage levels also appear problematic. The plans indicate a 150mm diameter outfall pipe leading to Moor Lane; however, the garden of 41 Moor Lane already slopes back toward the site, not away from it. This raises questions about whether the gradient is adequate for a gravity-fed system, or whether additional pumping will be required to achieve the necessary flow particularly for what is now proposed to be a combined system.

Drainage & Flood Management Plan

Given the steep gradient of the site, I have serious reservations about whether a crate system is appropriate. From my understanding, such systems perform best in well-draining soils, whereas areas with low soil permeability require an attenuation system with a controlled discharge rather than a simple soakaway. The submitted soil reports indicate that the majority of the site comprises soft

to firm yellow sandy clay and stiff yellow clay below 1.0m, which are known to drain poorly. Based on personal experience of my own garden at the bottom of the site, I question whether this system can operate effectively without increasing the risk of flooding to existing properties, including ours and those of our neighbours at the bottom of the slope.

Although I don't have technical expertise, I find it difficult to understand the need to fill the ground voids identified across the site in the Coal Survey, while also proposing that Plots 9 and 10 be built on raft foundations to accommodate potential ground movement when at the same time, it appears that large excavations will be made directly in front of these plots to install the drainage system. Wouldn't any instability or weakness in the surrounding ground risk causing premature failure of the drainage crates?

Maintenance and Long-Term Responsibility

Research indicates that crate systems also require accessible inspection points to enable regular maintenance and ensure long-term performance. While this appears to be acknowledged during the construction phase, there is no clear provision for inspection or maintenance beyond completion. If Kirklees Council will not be responsible for the site's ongoing management, could we please have clarification on who will be accountable for maintaining the drainage infrastructure and ensuring its continued adequacy.

Proposed Flood Routing and Bund Wall

The flood plan indicates the construction of a bund wall behind existing properties, with an exceedance flow route identified to the left of our house (via Point C1 across the council property's driveway) and another through the garden of 19 Summerbridge. I would appreciate confirmation that these routes have been properly assessed for capacity and safety, and that their impact on neighbouring properties has been fully modelled especially considering that should any blockage or maintenance issue cause failure to the planned route the natural route for any excess water would be to the bottom corner of the site, ie, our garden and property.

Construction Impact on Surrounding Properties

Finally, I would appreciate clarification on **Drawing PV2511-APP-92-XX-DR-C-2502**, which shows a silt fence to be installed across our driveway and property. This seems inconsistent with assurances that the development will have minimal impact on surrounding properties. Could you please confirm the purpose and necessity of this which we have neither been advised of nor consulted about?

Conclusion

While I recognise that the development is likely to proceed given the sums of money involved, I respectfully urge Kirklees Planning Officers and the

Developers to reconsider whether the proposed drainage and flood risk management system is truly robust enough to protect existing properties. Homes such as ours have stood on this site for over 130 years, and it is essential that any new development does not expose them to an increased flood risk due to inadequate or poorly maintained drainage infrastructure.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter. I would be grateful for a written response explaining how drainage and flood risk concerns will be managed in the revised plan, or reassurance regarding what recourse will be available in the event of future flooding.

Many thanks,