DC Admin

From:
Sent: 01 October 2026 22:56
To: Kerri Simpson
Cc: DC Admin
Subject: 2025/92968 – Formal objection to proposed residential development

Dear Planning Officer,

I am writing as a local resident to formally and strongly object to application 2025/92968 at 29 Huddersfield Road, Mirfield.

I appreciate that the online commenting period is shown as closed. However, the application remains undetermined and I ask that this objection is placed on the planning file and considered before any decision is made. Kirklees continues to invite correspondence and comments on planning applications by email.

I want to be absolutely clear from the outset: I object to this development in principle and believe this application should be refused.

This is not simply about whether individual technical problems can eventually be engineered around or dealt with through conditions. The proposed development represents yet further intensification of an area which has already undergone enormous change and deterioration within approximately five years.

Within a very short stretch of the A644 Huddersfield Road and its immediate surrounding roads we already have the park and two cricket grounds; Hurst Lane; the substantial six-bedroom development at 27 Huddersfield Road; Eastthorpe Hall with 14 vendors/business operators and more than 100 advertised classes per week associated with its pool and wellness operation; Mirfield Fire Station; significant school traffic associated with Crowlees; and the recently approved Domino's operation at the former Barclays Bank.

Residents already have ongoing active issues involving the Council concerning Hurst Lane, local business activity, parking and access, antisocial behaviour associated with the park and the impact of development within this immediate area.

The cumulative effect is unacceptable. This area is almost unrecognisable from what it was only five years ago, and residents are experiencing the combined consequences in terms of traffic, parking, noise, activity, pressure on infrastructure and deterioration in residential amenity and quality of life.

Against this background, a further seven dwellings are now proposed on a site which itself presents substantial environmental, ecological, highway, flood and drainage constraints.

The ecological implications are particularly concerning.

The Council's own Ecology Team records that the majority of the habitats on the site would be removed to facilitate the residential development.

Those habitats are not meaningless vacant land. The ecological assessment identifies suitable habitat for nesting birds, hedgehogs, reptiles and amphibians. The site provides foraging and commuting habitat for bats, with the trees along the western boundary and the canal providing valuable commuting corridors. There is also potential use of the canal environment by otters.

Buildings on the site have been identified as having bat-roost suitability, requiring presence/absence surveys before the application can be determined.

The Biodiversity Net Gain assessment also identified a net loss of 7.77 habitat units, with the Council stating at that stage that there was no clear plan demonstrating how the required statutory Biodiversity Net Gain would be achieved.

I do not consider that the answer to the destruction of existing habitat should simply be to calculate the loss and compensate for it elsewhere.

The existing ecology and wildlife of this site should carry meaningful weight when deciding whether development should take place here in the first place. Kirklees' own planning framework requires development to protect and enhance the natural environment, minimise impacts upon biodiversity and appropriately protect trees.

There are also significant tree implications. The Council's Trees service formally objected because the necessary assessment had not been provided and concluded that the design process had therefore taken place without full consideration of the site's tree constraints.

This becomes even more concerning because trees along the Huddersfield Road frontage are implicated in achieving the visibility required for the proposed new access.

The highway implications are equally difficult to understand.

This development does not simply propose continued use of the existing entrance. The existing access would be closed and a new junction created directly onto the A644 Huddersfield Road.

This is a main road, immediately alongside Mirfield Fire Station and within an already exceptionally busy environment involving school traffic, the park, cricket grounds, businesses, leisure activity and existing residential development.

Highways Development Management itself stated that the proposal could not be supported as submitted and required the necessary visibility to be demonstrated and a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit before planning approval.

Highways also specifically identified the cycle lane and parking bays opposite the proposed access and raised the issue of turning vehicles potentially encroaching across the centre line.

Access is the one matter that is not reserved under this outline application. The safety and appropriateness of creating this new junction onto the A644 is therefore fundamental to what the Council is being asked to approve now.

There are then the substantial flood and drainage concerns.

The Lead Local Flood Authority formally objected, stating that it was not clear how the site could be effectively drained and that a sequential approach had not been adopted.

Its response raises fundamental questions about the capacity of this land to accommodate the proposed development at all.

The LLFA identified potential requirements for surface-water attenuation and a foul-water pumping station requiring tanker access and a 15-metre stand-off from the nearest habitable room. It ruled out infiltration as an acceptable option on the information available, objected to pumping surface water and identified uncertainty over alternative drainage routes.

It also considered that dwellings should be positioned within Flood Zone 1.

All of these requirements compete for space on the same constrained site as the houses, road, turning areas, retained trees, replacement habitat and ecological mitigation.

I am also extremely concerned by the references to Hurst Lane.

The LLFA specifically discusses the gated connection with Hurst Lane, questions what rights exist in relation to the lane, considers whether third-party permission would be required and discusses the culverted watercourse beneath Hurst Lane as a possible drainage route. The Council's records apparently indicate that this system may be in poor condition.

Hurst Lane is already the subject of ongoing issues affecting residents.

I therefore require clear confirmation of exactly what is contemplated in relation to Hurst Lane as part of this development.

Is Hurst Lane intended, either now or subsequently, to accommodate any drainage works, utilities, construction traffic, pedestrian access, emergency access, vehicular access, maintenance access or any other infrastructure associated with this development?

I also ask the Council to address the wider cumulative position.

Planning applications cannot continue to be considered as though every development exists within a vacuum.

Residents experience the cumulative reality.

The school, park, cricket grounds, fire station, Hurst Lane, Eastthorpe Hall and its substantial commercial and leisure activity, the development at No. 27, existing homes and additional commercial activity all depend upon the same small surrounding area and highway network.

Now another residential development is proposed, requiring another newly engineered access directly onto the A644 and the removal of existing habitat.

There has to be a point at which the saturation of an area and the cumulative deterioration of residential amenity are recognised.

For the avoidance of any misunderstanding, I am not asking for this development to be redesigned or its problems to be addressed through a collection of planning conditions.

I object to the proposed residential development itself.

In my view, the cumulative pressure upon this location, loss of existing habitat, impact upon wildlife and trees, identified bat interests, substantial Biodiversity Net Gain deficit, flood and drainage constraints and the requirement for a new access directly onto this already heavily used section of the A644 demonstrate that this is the wrong site for further residential development.

I therefore ask Kirklees Council to refuse application 2025/92968.

Please confirm that this objection will be placed on the application file and considered before the application is determined.

Sincerely