

## DC Admin

---

**From:** Local Development  
**Sent:** 14 November 2025 09:26  
**To:** DC Admin  
**Subject:** FW: Planning Application Ref: 2025/92968

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 14 November 2025 08:48  
**To:** Local Development <Local.Development@kirklees.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Planning Application Ref: 2025/92968

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

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am submitting a strong objection to the above planning application. I request that my comments be published but that my personal details remain withheld.

---

# 1. Fundamental Highways and Access Concerns – The Area Cannot Take Any More

The proposal seeks to introduce new or altered **vehicular and pedestrian access**, alongside an extraordinary and unjustified increase in parking from **6 spaces to 26**. This represents a **dramatic intensification** of the site's usage and would significantly increase traffic movements onto **Huddersfield Road**, which is already well known to operate beyond safe capacity.

The reality for residents is this:

- The cumulative traffic from **rail works**
- Constant contractors' vehicles
- Changes to the **lane**
- Proposed alterations to **Moorlands**
- Other applications are already pending with Kirklees

has pushed the local infrastructure to breaking point.  
Adding yet another development of this scale would be **dangerous and irresponsible**.

Whatever the Highways Assessment claims, local experience clearly shows that the road network **cannot safely accommodate further development**. Visibility, turning movements, and pedestrian safety are already compromised. This proposal would worsen every one of those issues.

---

## 2. Flood Risk Has Been Downplayed – The Site Is on a Floodplain

Despite what the applicant states, this area **does flood**. Residents witness this first-hand. Water regularly collects and runs off surrounding land, and the flooding extends further than indicated on official online maps — particularly after heavy rainfall.

The applicant's claim that the site is not at flood risk is **inaccurate, misleading, and must be challenged**.

A development involving:

- Increased hardstanding
- Increased vehicle use
- Altered drainage
- Additional roof area

will **inevitably worsen surface-water flooding**, both on-site and downstream.

At a time when flooding nationally is worsening, allowing development on a known floodplain — while its existence is minimised in the application — is indefensible.

---

## 3. Severe Cumulative Impact – Residents Are Already Under Relentless Strain

The ongoing rail alterations have caused **constant disruption**, noise, and increased traffic for an extended period of time. These impacts have fundamentally changed day-to-day living conditions.

To now allow yet another development, with more traffic, more noise, more works, and more infrastructure pressure, would be **deeply harmful**.

The cumulative impact on the community is **severe, ongoing, and wholly unacceptable**. No assessment submitted by the applicant adequately acknowledges, let alone mitigates, this lived reality.

---

## 4. Environmental and Biodiversity Concerns – Evidence Is Incomplete and Questionable

The applicant acknowledges potential harm to:

- Protected species
- Priority habitats
- Local biodiversity features

Yet the ecological information provided is unclear, incomplete, and poorly evidenced. The **biodiversity baseline** conveniently calculated just days before submission raises concerns about accuracy — especially given recent disturbances on and around the site.

If any habitats were altered prior to survey, the baseline figure is **invalid**, and any claim of “net gain” becomes meaningless.

This alone warrants refusal or deeming the application invalid.

---

## 5. Character and Residential Amenity – Gross Overdevelopment

The proposal represents an inappropriate and excessive intensification of the site. A jump from 6 to 26 parking spaces, plus altered access, would radically change the character of the area.

This is **overdevelopment**, plain and simple.

It would:

- Increase noise
- Reduce residential amenity
- Damage local character
- Generate unacceptable disturbance

The planning balance here clearly weighs against approval.

---

## 6. The Community Is at Saturation Point – This Application Should Not Proceed

Taking all of the above together:

- Highways risks
- Flooding concerns
- Environmental harm
- Cumulative disruption
- Infrastructure strain

It is clear that this area has already absorbed far more than is reasonable. Adding this development on top would be **devastating** for residents and wholly contrary to the principles of sustainable, responsible planning.

For these reasons, I strongly urge the Council to refuse the application in full.

Thank you for considering this objection.

Yours faithfully,