About the application

Application number: 2025/93355	
What is the application for?:	Erection of 75 residential dwellings with associated landscaping, open space, hi
Address of the site or building:	Land off, Woodward Court, Mirfield, WF14 0PY
Postcode:	LS15 8ZB

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	Yes

I wish to formally object to the current planning application 2025/93355 on the grounds that it fails to address the fundamental reasons for refusal of the previous application and, critically, proposes an increased number of dwellings, rising from 61 to 75. This represents a significant intensification of development and serves to further reinforce, rather than overcome, the original reasons for refusal.

The previous application was refused on the basis that the proposed development would lead to additional traffic impacts on an already constrained local highway network. The refusal clearly identified the inherent limitations of the surrounding road infrastructure, including the existing network of narrow roads, the substandard visibility at the junction of Hepworth Lane and Shillbank Lane/Flash Lane, and the site's close proximity to Crossley Fields Junior and Infant School. These factors were found to result in an unsafe development that failed to adequately mitigate conflicts between all users, including pedestrians, cyclists, parents with children, and vehicular traffic.

There has been no material change in circumstances since the previous refusal. The highway network remains constrained, roads remain narrow, visibility at the junction remains substandard, and the proximity of the school continues to create congestion and heightened safety risks. No substantive highway improvements have been delivered that would address or overcome these fundamental safety concerns.

Furthermore, the current proposal exacerbates these issues by increasing the number of dwellings from 61 to 75. This increase will inevitably generate additional vehicle movements, including private car trips, deliveries and visitor traffic. Far from mitigating the previous concerns, this intensification places further pressure on a highway network already deemed incapable of safely accommodating the level of traffic associated with the earlier, smaller planning application.

The application also relies on the assertion that the development will "utilise the Site's sustainable location to maximise trips by walking, cycling and public transport and to minimise trips by car." This statement is far from realistic and does not reflect current travel behaviour. In today's society, many households are reliant on private vehicles due to work patterns, childcare responsibilities, limited public transport capacity and the practicalities of daily life. Expecting a development of this scale, particularly adjacent to a school and served by narrow local roads, to significantly reduce car usage lacks common sense and is not supported by evidence. Such assumptions underestimate the likely level of car ownership and traffic generation and therefore undermine the credibility of the transport assessment.

As a result, the proposal remains contrary to paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy T10 of the Kirklees Unitary Development Plan and Policy PLP21 of the Kirklees Publication Draft Local Plan. The application has failed to demonstrate that the development would be safe or acceptable in highway and transport terms.

In conclusion, there has been no material change to justify a different decision, and the increased number of dwellings only strengthens the original reasons for refusal. The application should therefore be refused on the same highway safety grounds as previously identified.