About the application

Application number: 2025/93480	
What is the application for?:	Erection of 28 dwellings with associated landscaping and external works
Address of the site or building:	Land off Parkwood Road/Weavers Lane, Longwood, Huddersfield, HD3 4TT
Postcode:	

User comments

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

I wish to register a formal objection to the above planning application. My property directly borders the proposed development site, and after reviewing the submitted documentation, I have serious concerns regarding flood risk, land contamination, ground stability, amenity impacts, highway safety, and ecological harm. These are all recognised material planning considerations that must be fully assessed before any permission is granted.

---

1. Flood Risk – Lack of Assessment and Increased Danger to My Property

A stream runs directly between my property and the proposed development site. The application contains no meaningful flood risk assessment, no hydrological modelling, and no assurances that the development will not increase surface water runoff or redirect flows toward my home.

Under the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraphs 159–169 require developments to demonstrate that they will not increase flood risk elsewhere. The applicant has not met this requirement.

Relevant case law:

• R (on the application of Loader) v Rother District Council [2016] EWHC 1870 (Admin) – permission was quashed because the council failed to properly consider flood risk evidence.
• Berkeley v Secretary of State for the Environment [2001] 2 AC 603 – emphasises the need for proper environmental assessment where risks are foreseeable.

Given the proximity of the stream and the absence of mitigation measures, the risk to my property is unacceptable.

my property is unacceptable.

---

2. Land Contamination – No Assessment Despite Known Industrial History

When my own development was approved, contamination surveys identified harmful chemicals associated with historic industrial activity from the nearby mill. The current application includes no Phase 1 or Phase 2 contamination assessment, despite the site sharing the same industrial history.

This is a breach of NPPF paragraphs 183–187, which require developers to demonstrate that land is safe and suitable for use.

Relevant case law:

• R (on the application of Redland Minerals Ltd) v Surrey County Council [2010] EWHC 1299 (Admin) – planning permission was overturned due to inadequate assessment of contamination risks.
• Celtic Energy Ltd v Secretary of State [2013] EWHC 2149 (Admin) – reinforces the duty to properly assess environmental hazards before granting permission.

Excavation of contaminated land poses risks to public health, groundwater, and the adjacent stream.

---

3. Ground Stability – Risk to My Retaining Wall

My property includes a substantial retaining wall close to the boundary. The proposed works involve excavation and ground disturbance, yet the applicant has provided no ground stability report, no geotechnical survey, and no assessment of potential impact on neighbouring structures.

Under NPPF paragraph 174, planning authorities must ensure that developments are stable and do not create land slip or subsidence risks.

Relevant case law:

• R (on the application of Holborn Studios) v Hackney LBC [2017] EWHC 2823 (Admin) – failure to consider structural impacts on neighbouring land rendered the permission unlawful.
• Murphy v Brentwood District Council [1991] 1 AC 398 – establishes the importance of ensuring construction does not cause foreseeable structural harm.

Without a stability assessment, the proposal is unsafe.

---

4. Anti Social Behaviour Risk – Proposed Alleyway Adjacent to My Property

The application proposes an alleyway/access route directly beside my home. There is no lighting plan, no security measures, and no design out crime assessment.

Under Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, planning authorities must consider crime prevention in decision making.

Relevant precedent:

• R (on the application of McLeod) v Haringey LBC [2016] EWHC 1137 (Admin) – councils must consider crime prevention measures when approving developments.

An unlit, unmanaged alleyway increases the likelihood of anti social behaviour and reduces safety.

---

5. Noise, Traffic, Parking and General Amenity Impact

Both my partner and I work from home, and the development will significantly increase noise levels, traffic movements, and parking pressure on already narrow estate roads.

The NPPF requires planning authorities to prevent developments that cause "unacceptable levels of noise, pollution, or loss of amenity" (paragraphs 130 and 185).

Relevant case law:

• Coventry v Lawrence [2014] UKSC 13 – confirms that noise and disturbance affecting residential enjoyment are legitimate planning considerations.
• R (on the application of Kides) v South Cambridgeshire DC [2002] EWCA Civ 1370 – councils must consider all material impacts on residential amenity.

The cumulative impact on daily life has not been assessed.

---

6. Harm to Local Wildlife – Foxes, Bats, Deer, Rabbits, Badgers Birds if pr

The site is home to a range of wildlife, including protected species such as bats and potentially badgers. The application contains no ecological survey, no bat activity survey, and no mitigation strategy.

This breaches the NPPF paragraphs 174–180, which require protection and enhancement of biodiversity.

Relevant case law:

• Morge v Hampshire County Council [2011] UKSC 2 – councils must ensure developments do not breach wildlife protection laws.
• R (on the application of Bagshaw) v Wyre BC [2014] EWHC 508 (Admin)