DC Admin

From: Katie Chew
Sent: 10 June 2026 06:44
To: DC Admin
Subject: FW: Addendum Ref:2025/93355

From
Sent: 28 May 2026 10:28
To: Katie Chew <Katie.Chew@kirklees.gov.uk>
Subject: Addendum Ref:2025/93355

Dear Katie,

This addendum to our original objection document includes summaries of two of our key objections to the above application for which we have already submitted a detailed report.

We commissioned a report from (see report attached), which states that the investigations done by Lithos for the applicant do not conform to British Standards regarding the geology of the site. The findings thus produced cannot be considered adequate or reliable.

Summaries:

Highways

None of the previous reasons for refusals on Highways grounds have been overcome. The local infrastructure has not been improved. The surrounding roads are narrow and very busy at times. Visibility at the bottom of Woodward Court is restricted and difficult and 3rd party land has not been obtained. Whilst various proposals have been made to address speed reduction, these would be superfluous at busy times as they do not improve the capacity of the road. Added to which, more street "furniture" in front of the school will increase the possible confusion of motorists as there are already a number of signs and road markings in place already. Hepworth lane, already described as "unsuitable for intensification" in the Local Plan assessment, is a potential added danger point. The

planned “rat run” through the proposed estate will inevitably increase traffic in Jenny Lane, Wellhouse Lane in front of the school and Woodward Court and Hepworth Lane.

Drainage.

We are concerned about drainage at the southern end of the site as well as the shallow mine workings and potential instability of the land. These would negatively impact local residents.

As referred to earlier, please see the report from appended. His expert analysis of the Lithos report outlines all the weaknesses of the investigations even allowing for the recent works done on the site.

There are of course other reasons why we believe that this application should be refused, such as the impact on a Grade II listed building, air-pollution etc but our prime concern is safety.

Communications

In addition, we thought that you should know about the communication problems and other issues that have occurred in the last few months. We are very disappointed that these have occurred but hope that the following list is helpful and will help prevent these happening in the future.

i) The premature publication online in October 2025 of the application on Kirklees “My account” caused panic and unnecessary worry in those residents who saw it. It was removed once reported.

ii) Posting the application online on Christmas Eve appeared to be a deliberate attempt to use the holiday period to conceal a well-known contentious issue. It may not have been intended but the “optics” were not good. However, it is true that the planning department did acknowledge that the objection period should be extended.

iii) Significant changes to the original plans were made and this separate second plan did not go before a Public Consultation. Whilst this is not compulsory it again looks poor to the public.

iv) Several objections that were submitted in the correct manner, including that from Save Mirfield, were “mislaid”. They only appeared after re-sending or querying their absence. This is unacceptable. We do not know if, or how many, others were missing.

v) A large number of cameras were installed in the area. We have been unable to confirm who authorised them, although we believe they may have been installed by the developer. Residents were not informed, and many were concerned about the loss of privacy because several cameras appeared to have 360-degree views into gardens and potentially into homes. The cameras were removed after about 48 hours.

vi) The school was concerned about the children sitting their important SATS but at no time did the developer seek to warn the school about the work. I understand that the Head teachers contacted you.

vii) Neighbours of the site complained about the lack of dust mitigation measures that were supposed to be employed on the site. It appears that none were used. Why? This caused very inconvenient and uncomfortable dust clouds coating the windows and vehicles nearby. Of course, for some people this was also a potential health hazard. I understand that some people complained to the appropriate department but did not receive an explanation as to why mitigation measures were either not employed or were inadequate. This was also a problem at the last application in 2017/2018.

viii) The whole process is now in it’s fifth month and as I explained previously the community is feeling stressed. Please would it be possible to have a regular update that we can pass on to them?

DC Admin

Dear Sir / Madam

In my capacity of a consultant engineering geologist, I have reviewed the ground investigation report produced by Lithos in 2017 on the Balderstone fields site on behalf of Save Mirfield.

Over my 45 years in the geotechnical industry, I have scoped and specified ground investigations for several hundred sites. I have also reviewed a similar number produced by third parties. I am, and have been, for the last 20 years, involved with the writing of National and International standards, that cover ground investigation. Within the British Standards Institution, I chair the technical committee on ground investigation and represent the UK in Europe with regard to ground investigation.

The starting point for all ground investigations is to set out to understand the geology and groundwater that are present below the site in question. This requires forming exploratory holes of appropriate type and depth. It also involves undertaking the investigation in accordance with all the current standards and industry accepted best practice.

With regard to the Lithos investigation and report, the main things that stand out to me are:

1) Lithos have not used all the relevant current standards for ground investigation that were in force at the time of their Ground Investigation

2) No rotary cored boreholes have ever been drilled on this site and therefore there is no reference point to understand the geology and in particular the mining situation

3) No deep-water wells have been installed and therefore there can be no understanding of the site hydrogeology.

In my opinion, the investigation does not address the key questions that are posed by this site, namely geology, mining and groundwater. In order to understand these matters, further appropriate ground investigation will be required.

Regards

Engineering Geologist

Bsc, Msc, C.Geol. RoGEP Advisor

References:

Lithos. Geoenvironmental Appraisal. Land at Balderstone Hall, Mirfield for Bellway Homes Ltd - Yorkshire Report no: Date: 1668/1E December 2017.