DC Admin

From:
Sent: 19 March 2026 23:05
To: DC Admin; Katie Chew
Subject: Re: our " lost " Objection - ref 2025/93355

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi

Please see objection pasted into the body of this email (as opposed to as an attachment), to avoid the email being blocked again. The objection was initially submitted on 2 February 2026 and again on 3 March 2026.

Please kindly confirm safe receipt.

Thank you.

Dear Ms Chew

Re: Planning Application 2025/93355 – Proposed Development of 75 Dwellings at land off Woodward Court/Hepworth Lane, Mirfield

I write to formally object to the above planning application.

I am a resident living on Crossley Lane, Mirfield, in close proximity to the proposed development. My objection is based on material planning considerations, with particular emphasis on highway safety, pedestrian safety, child safeguarding, infrastructure capacity, and conflict with the Kirklees Local Plan.

1. Unsuitable road network surrounding the site (Policy LP21)

The proposed development is enveloped almost entirely by narrow rural lanes: Wellhouse Lane, Hepworth Lane, Flash Lane, Shillbank Lane, and Crossley Lane. Each of these lanes is either partially or entirely single track, due to a combination of inherent road width and unavoidable on-street parking.

The only road surrounding the entire circumference of the proposed development that is not a lane is Lockwood Avenue, which is approximately 200 metres long. In practice, this road is already nearly impassable to vehicles due to the necessary and chaotic on-street parking by existing residents.

These lanes are not designed to accommodate additional traffic associated with a development of 75 dwellings. They feature:

- Intermittent or entirely absent footpaths;
- No formal passing places;
- Limited visibility; and,

· Regular on-street parking which further reduces carriageway width.

The addition of traffic generated by 75 new homes will place unsustainable pressure on these surrounding highways which are demonstrably already operating beyond their functional capacity. The surrounding infrastructure simply cannot withstand further traffic increases.

Any increase in traffic will inevitably lead to greater congestion, vehicle conflict, and risk to pedestrians. This is directly contrary to Local Plan Policy LP21, which requires development to provide safe and suitable access for all users and not result in unacceptable highway safety impacts.

2. Personal safety experience – Walking with young children (Policies LP20 and LP21)

I exit my home directly onto Crossley Lane, where there is no footpath.

Even with current traffic levels, walking feels unsafe. Vehicles regularly pass close by, and there is nowhere to step aside safely. I must remain constantly alert. Any increase in traffic resulting from this development will significantly worsen this already dangerous situation.

Should the proposed development be approved, I will be effectively faced with two unacceptable options:

· Walk along an increasingly busy lane with no pavement and accept an increased risk to ; or
· Drive short journeys to or local shops, thereby adding yet more traffic to an already overburdened single-track lane.

Neither outcome aligns with the principles of sustainable development, and both conflict with Policy LP20 (Inclusive Communities) and Policy LP21.

3. Child safeguarding and proximity to Crossley Fields School

The proposed development neighbours Crossley Fields Infant & Junior School. The roads surrounding the school already suffer from severe congestion at drop-off and pick-up times. All surrounding roads are effectively single track, either by design or due to essential on-street parking.

Additional housing will worsen this situation significantly, particularly as parents living within the proposed development will be dropping off and collecting children on their way to and from work, or passing by at peak times during their normal commute. This will result in:

· Increased congestion on unsuitable roads;
· Unsafe vehicle manoeuvres; and,
· Greater risk to children and parents travelling on foot, often along lanes with intermittent or absent pavements.

This is not a theoretical concern. It is a daily, observable problem, and the proposal materially increases safeguarding risks for school children.

4. Modern traffic reality and previous refusal

The proposed development has previously been refused on the grounds that the surrounding road network is insufficient. That situation has not improved. In reality, it has worsened.

Traffic associated with new housing today extends far beyond resident vehicles. It includes frequent movements from: delivery drivers (Amazon, Evri, Royal Mail, DHL); supermarket deliveries (Asda, Tesco, Sainsbury's, Ocado); tradespeople, carers, dog walkers, visitors, and service vehicles.

This modern traffic reality must be considered when assessing cumulative highway impact. The surrounding lanes were not designed for either the volume or frequency of use, and the proposal fails to demonstrate how this demand can be safely accommodated.

It should also be noted that outline consent has been approved for 45-48 new dwellings on land to the east of Northorpe Lane, Mirfield. This will bring increased traffic to the relevant area when compared to present day levels, and should not be forgotten when considering the proposal.

5. Increasing traffic levels as pandemic-era working patterns recede

During the COVID-19 pandemic, traffic levels were temporarily reduced due to widespread working-from-home arrangements. While some hybrid working has persisted in the immediate aftermath of the pandemic, there is now a clear and well-documented shift toward increased office attendance.

For example, an Indeed UK labour market analysis (2025) showed that 85% of job adverts require at least two days per week in the office, up significantly from 2022 levels of 65%. Further, commercial property data from Remit Consulting's ReTurn report (2025) indicates UK office occupancy has reached its highest levels since lockdown, which causes increased daily commuting. I know this data to be true from a local and personal perspective as my own employer and the employers of my peers are demanding an increased physical office presence going forwards.

This evidence demonstrates that any easing of traffic observed in recent years is temporary and already reversing. Traffic levels can reasonably be expected to continue rising toward pre-pandemic norms.

It would therefore be unsound to base permanent and irreversible planning decisions on exceptional, short-term traffic conditions created by the pandemic. Highway and safety assessments must reflect long-term, realistic traffic patterns — particularly in an area already constrained by inadequate infrastructure.

6. Genuine safety concerns

Housing objections are sometimes dismissed as resistance to change or "NIMBYism". In some cases, that may be true. This is not one of those cases. This proposal — like the four that preceded it — is patently unsafe.

What if a driver is distracted? What if children stumble, as young children naturally do, further into the road? And I do not mean stepping off a pavement — there are few pavements.

These are real, everyday risks faced by families living here now. The proposed development materially increases those risks.

7. Residential Amenity and Quality of Life (Policy LP16)

The cumulative impact of increased traffic, congestion, noise, and safety risk will significantly harm the amenity of existing residents, particularly families with young children Matters which most

people would take for granted, such as walking their children to school, would be unavailable ; it simply would not be worth risking their safety.

This conflicts with Policy LP16 (Quality Places), which seeks to protect residential amenity and create safe, high-quality living environments.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, the proposed development is contrary to Kirklees Local Plan Policies LP20, LP21, LP16, and LP4, and fails to adequately address serious and well-evidenced concerns relating to highway safety, pedestrian provision, and child safeguarding.

I respectfully request that Kirklees Council refuses this application.

Yours faithfully,

Primrose Barn, 272-274 Crossley Lane, Mirfield, WF14 0NR