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 object to the above planning application for the following material planning reasons:
The proposal for 75 dwellings will generate an unacceptable level of additional traffic movements on a road network already under significant pressure. The nearby network consists of unsuitable road junctions that currently lack the capacity to safely handle further increases in vehicle volume safely.
The site is located immediately adjacent to two schools. The influx of 75 new households will substantially increase traffic during peak drop-off and pick-up times, creating a major risk to the safety of children. Increased traffic in a school zone is a critical highway safety concern that must be prioritized over development density.
The local area already suffers from unsafe parking on pavements and at junctions, which restricts visibility for drivers and creates hazards for vulnerable pedestrians. This development will exacerbate these existing issues.
The current proposal for 75 dwellings represents a significant increase from the previous application for 61 houses, which was refused, not least because of highway safety issues due to the Councils determination of “the existing network of narrow roads, the close proximity of the proposal to the existing school (Crossley Fields Junior and Infant School), and the substandard visibility at the junction of Woodward Court and Wellhouse Lane, would result in an unsafe development which would fail to acceptably mitigate the degree of conflict between all users.” Increasing the density on a site that has previously been deemed unsuitable for a smaller number of dwellings constitutes unacceptable overdevelopment. This high density is out of character with the surrounding area and will place undue strain on local infrastructure.
The planning history of the site is a significant material consideration. Given that a 61-house scheme was previously refused, it is illogical to approve an even larger 75-house development that intensifies every ground on which the prior application was rejected.
The proposed development fails to meet local and national planning policies regarding highway safety and sustainable development density. For these reasons the application should be refused.