

**Sent:** 12 February 2026 09:56  
**To:** Ellie Thornhill <Ellie.Thornhill@kirklees.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Objection - Planning Application Ref: 2025/62/93480/W

Dear Ellie Thornhill,

**RE: Planning Application Ref: 2025/62/93480/W**

I am writing to formally object to the proposed planning application **2025/62/93480/W** relating to the proposed housing estate at **Land off Parkwood Road/Weavers Lane, Longwood, Huddersfield, HD3 4TT**.

My objection is based on the proposed application conflicting with multiple of the adopted Kirklees Local Plan and concerns regarding highway safety, sustainable transport, green infrastructure, biodiversity protection, and transparency/accuracy of submitted evidence.

## **1. Inappropriate and Unsuitable Main Access (Conflict with Transport & Highways Policies):**

- The proposal uses an existing housing estate road as the primary access for the entire development. This road is not designed for the volume or type of traffic that would result, and raises significant highway safety, congestion, and residential concerns.
- The transport assessment has evidenced a very narrow window of assessment of existing vehicles. It also does not reflect the number of children that currently use the enclosed estate on bikes and scooters, adding additional risk to the current use of the estate and is therefore not reflective of the current use of the road or supportive of the existing community.
- The Kirklees Local Plan transport and highways policies require that development proposals provide safe and suitable access arrangements and should not create unacceptable impacts on highway safety or function. Development is expected to integrate appropriately with the existing transport network and be supported by proportionate and robust evidence. In this case, the access strategy appears inconsistent with those requirements.

## **2. Misleading Pedestrian Connectivity (Conflict with Sustainable Travel Policies):**

- The submitted plans show a new pedestrian route linking to a path in the green space adjacent which does not yet currently exist, and this land is managed by the estate owners of the associated housing estate. This is misleading and undermines the credibility of the sustainable transport claims made within the application.
- The Local Plan transport strategy policies promote genuine, deliverable walking and cycling connections and integration with established networks. Showing connections to non-existent routes fails to meet the Local Plan's sustainable travel and connectivity objectives and overstates the accessibility benefits of the scheme.

## **3. Increased Car Traffic and Unsustainable Transport Impact:**

- By routing all traffic through a constrained residential road and failing to demonstrate realistic and deliverable alternatives for sustainable travel, the proposal would increase private car use and vehicle movements in the area.
- The Local Plan strategy supports reducing reliance on private cars and prioritising walking, cycling, and public transport. A development that increases traffic through unsuitable residential streets conflicts with these strategic transport and sustainability objectives.

## **4. Very Minimal Green Space Provision (Conflict with Green Infrastructure and Urban Green Space Policies):**

- The layout shows very limited green and open space for a development of this scale. This appears inconsistent with Local Plan policies on green infrastructure and urban green space, which seek to protect, enhance, and provide accessible green areas as part of new development.
- Policy requirements relating to urban green space, open space provision, and wider green infrastructure networks expect developments to deliver meaningful, functional, and accessible green areas that contribute to health, biodiversity, and visual amenity. The current proposal appears to fall short of these standards, regardless of the suggested contribution to other green spaces as part of a Section 106 Agreement.

## **5. Biodiversity and Protected Species Concerns (Conflict with Biodiversity Policies):**

- The application site is known to have protected species and ecological value. However, the submitted information does not clearly demonstrate how impacts will be avoided, adequately mitigated, or compensated.

- Local Plan biodiversity policies (including those relating to biodiversity and geodiversity and the Kirklees Wildlife Habitat Network) require development to avoid harm, maintain habitat connectivity, and deliver measurable biodiversity enhancement. The current submission does not appear to convincingly demonstrate compliance with these policy requirements.

#### **6. Unreadable Ecological/Biodiversity Statement (Failure of Evidence and Transparency Requirements):**

- The Ecological/Biodiversity Statement currently available on the planning portal is not in a readable format, and therefore does not appear to be reasonable documentation to support the application, and therefore should not be considered as evidence to demonstrate compliance with local policies.
- This prevents residents and consultees from properly reviewing and assessing the impact of the development.
- The Local Plan suggests that decision making should be evidence-based and transparent. Supporting documents therefore should be accessible and legible so that material considerations can be properly weighed. In its current form, this requirement is not met.

#### **7. Application Not Discoverable by Postcode Search (Consultation Accessibility Concern):**

- The application does not appear when searching by postcode on the planning portal (HD7 or HD3), which makes it difficult for local residents to find, review, and comment on the proposal. This creates a barrier to public participation and undermines the fairness and transparency of the consultation process
- Given the Local Plan's emphasis on clear, evidence based and community informed decision-making, planning applications should be readily discoverable using standard search methods, including postcode. The current situation risks limiting awareness and engagement from affected residents.

#### **Conclusion:**

For the reasons above, the proposal conflicts with multiple elements of the Kirklees Local Plan, particularly those relating to highways and access, sustainable transport, green infrastructure, urban green space, and biodiversity protection. It also fails basic transparency standards due to unreadable and hard to find supporting documentation.

Kind Regards,