DC Admin

Sent: 27 January 2026 17:02
To: DC Admin
Subject: Objection to Proposed Residential Development. Your Ref. No. 2025/93355

Dear Sir/Madam

I am formally objecting to the above residential development application. My wife and I have lived at 89c Wellhouse Lane, Mirfield, WF14 0BG since May 1967, and our three children have been brought up here.

Our property has a driveway with access to Wellhouse Lane at one end and access to Jenny Lane at the other. Our house is on the corner of these two roads and from our front bedroom window, we have a panoramic view of the road junction where Wellhouse Lane, Wellhouse Avenue and Jenny Lane meet one another. Our three children and two of our grandchildren have been educated at Crossley Fields School. We know the area well!

I have been a supporter of the "Save Mirfield" organisation for several years. The concerns about planning compliance, flood and drainage risks, design and layout of the development, impacts on infrastructure, traffic and road safety, effects on wildlife and biodiversity have all been there on previous proposals submitted by Bellway. These need to be re-visited and updated.

Now there are concerns about Hepworth Lane's increased traffic volume. Its narrowness and lack of footpaths are particularly significant. From our perspective, far too often, there are traffic congestions, traffic jams, motorist parking their vehicles on footpaths and across driveways leading to disputes between residents and motorists, stationary cars parked with their engines idling causing increased pollution of the atmosphere.

I have read a letter from Bellway dated January 2026 in which a map is included, but the information in three of the corners is unreadable unless viewed using a powerful magnifying glass. My interpretation of some of the details on this map suggests that there may be a road leading from Woodward Court to Hepworth Lane which could be the makings of a "Rat run." However, I may be wrong! A proper map would be more helpful.

The most important matter for consideration is to do with the increased amount of traffic using the area (maybe up to 150 vehicles or more) and the new development will also house more children (easily 50+) which will significantly raise the footfall around Crossley Fields School and the surrounding area.

Road safety is of paramount concern. Traffic incidents will happen. The worst scenario would be the loss of a precious young child's life. An inquest may follow, and when all the circumstances of the

event are scrutinised, it could be that those associated with agreeing and accepting the plan are partly to blame.

I don't know if such an incident has happened before, but that does not mean that it will never happen, nor that it is a low risk. That child's loss of life will never be forgotten. I don't know if there has been a thoroughly unbiased, comprehensive, professional, independent risk assessment conducted by anyone on this issue. If not, then the development must not be started in my opinion.

Unfortunately, the rejection of the plan will not help to fulfil the house building target set by the Central Government for Kirklees Council. However, I believe that in the long run the stakes are too high and effectively it would be unwise to continue further with any planned development. "GAMBLING WITH CHILDREN'S LIVES" could be an appropriate headline comment made by the press.