

## About the application

Application number: 2025/92968	
What is the application for?:	Outline application for erection of residential development
Address of the site or building:	29, Huddersfield Road, Mirfield, WF14 8AE
Postcode:	WF14 8AE

## User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	Yes
<p><b>FORMAL OBJECTION</b></p> <p>I object to this application and request that it be refused. This objection should be read alongside previously submitted comments.</p> <p>1. Failure to Comply with BS 5837 and Local Plan Policies LP33 and LP24(i)</p> <p>The application fails to submit mandatory arboricultural documentation required where development may affect trees, contrary to BS 5837: Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction and the Kirklees Local Plan.</p> <p>The following required documents have not been provided:</p> <p>Tree survey and retention value assessment</p> <p>Arboricultural Impact Assessment</p> <p>Arboricultural Method Statement</p> <p>Tree Protection Plan</p> <p>Schedule of works</p> <p>Existing and proposed site levels</p> <p>As confirmed by KC Trees, tree impacts have not been assessed and the scheme has been designed without proper consideration of tree constraints. This directly conflicts with LP33, which resists development threatening trees of amenity value and requires compliance with national standards, and LP24(i), which requires retention of valuable landscape features as part of good design.</p> <p>2. Cumulative Harm and Precedent – 27 Huddersfield Road</p> <p>The nearby development at 27 Huddersfield Road has already caused significant visual harm through loss of its front garden, replacement with hardstanding, and inappropriate materials that undermine the character of the street. This development sets a harmful precedent. Approval of this application would compound cumulative visual and environmental degradation along Huddersfield Road.</p> <p>3. Highways, Access, and Congestion</p> <p>The highways submission is incomplete and misleading.</p> <p>It addresses access but fails to properly assess egress onto the A644.</p> <p>The A644 is already severely congested, often stationary for extended periods.</p> <p>Visibility for vehicles exiting the site towards Dewsbury is extremely poor.</p> <p>Claimed traffic speeds of 0–30mph do not reflect reality; actual conditions are frequently 0–20mph.</p>	

irregularly 0-3mph.

Collision risk would materially increase with additional vehicle movements.

Congestion is further exacerbated by:

Moorlands Cricket Club clubhouse development

The adjacent fire station

Eastthorpe Hall operations and associated parking demand

School pick-up and drop-off activity directly opposite the site

Hurst Lane, an unadopted and privately managed lane, is already under pressure from non-resident parking. The proposal would significantly worsen conditions.

#### 4. Flood Risk – Inaccurate Assessment

Part of the site lies within a designated floodplain. The Flood Risk Assessment downplays risk and contradicts historic flooding events, including flooding extending into Lowlands Road and submerging the canal towpath.

Claims that the canal provides a reliable buffer are speculative and inconsistent with climate change realities. Surface water and groundwater risks are understated.

Persistent waterlogging occurs, surface water flows down Hurst Lane towards Gill Bridge, and drainage from Nos. 5 and 7 Hurst Lane enters the site.

The canal-side land functions as washland. Any raised development would displace floodwater, increasing risk to existing dwellings at Nos. 3, 5, and 7 Hurst Lane.

#### 5. Ecology, Biodiversity, and Loss of Amenity

The site supports established wildlife associated with the floodplain and canal corridor.

As the last undeveloped land close to Mirfield centre, it provides visual amenity and recreational value for canal users and walkers. Development would result in permanent loss of biodiversity and green infrastructure value.

#### 6. Residential Amenity and Infrastructure Capacity

The proposal would cause:

Significant construction disturbance

Loss of privacy to neighbouring residents

Additional pressure on roads, schools, and healthcare services already operating beyond capacity

Further residential intensification in this location is unsustainable.

#### Conclusion

This application:

Fails to provide mandatory supporting information

Conflicts with adopted Local Plan policies

Underestimates highways, flood, ecological, and cumulative impacts

Risks serious harm to residential amenity and infrastructure

The submitted reports present a selective and misleading narrative. The proposal is unsound and should be refused.