

24/04/2026

Planning Application 2026/62/90144/E

Dear Sirs,

We wish to object to this planning application on multiple grounds but with a focus on the damage done to the site in advance of a planning application, and the self-build aspect of the site.

Ecology

The applicant procured the site from the council at auction. Within a matter of weeks, the applicant in August 2025 and September 2025 destroyed virtually all the trees, bushes and vegetation. At the time we wrote to our local councillors about this matter and shared photographs. Cllr Tim Bamford responded on several occasions and advised us that any site clearance should be undertaken after a thorough inspection by ecologists to ensure there are no nesting birds or other wildlife (including bats) that could be disturbed, or any other ecological sensitivities.

Cllr Bamford also informed the planning department and shared the photographs we sent to him and received a response from Katie in the Ecology team, who advised she was not aware of any planning application for this site. Katie from the Ecology team has subsequently written the ecology report and makes no mention of the condition of the site prior to the destruction by the applicant. We would ask why, despite being fully informed of this information, she has chosen to make no reference to this in her report?

Further site activities took place in early 2026 to remove all but one of the trees on the southeast boundary of the site which all but completed the destruction of the treeline by the applicant.

The Trees team appears to have done due diligence and clearly states that the applicant has destroyed the vegetation, trees and boundary hedgerow. They also state this is poor practice and we are particularly concerned on the impact of local wildlife, including bats.

This is a clear attempt to circumvent these obligations and the applicant is fully aware of what and why they have done this. It is our understanding that on other sites the council have rejected planning applications based on the behaviour of the applicant in respect to the ecology of the site and the disregard for the statutory obligations.

Site Design

What is the purpose of retaining the existing gate and creating a small section of hard core? The applicant has moved the main entrance further northwest up the plot so it is unnecessary to have two entrances on such a small site frontage, especially as the site is opposite to existing properties and a small side road into Briarfield. One could conclude that the intention of retaining this existing gate provides the applicant the opportunity to further develop the site and add a further development to the rear of the site. The location of the plot also supports this conclusion. Would two dwellings on this site be allowed given the proximity of existing properties? The additional driveway and potential for more vehicles on Leak Hall Road should be considered as detrimental to the area.

We are further aware that the applicant has shared plans with other residents (included below) showing more than one development, and how the multiple entrances to the site would be utilised, which suggests a desire to develop the site further differently to this application. It should be noted that the clearance of the trees on the southeast boundary is critical to this proposed secondary driveway and would indicate why the applicant removed all those trees also earlier this year.

Ground

The site is known to have significant culverts running through it of which have proved challenging to document. Over the recent years Yorkshire Water and the Council have carried out multiple investigations into this site to try and resolve the locations and significance of these culverts.

How can it be feasible to allow significant construction traffic during the development and permanent installations to be built near and over this culvert infrastructure without successfully identifying all the network?

Furthermore, this network is likely to be old and should the council deem this application to be feasible surely a requirement to replace with modern infrastructure prior to any works being carried out is a must. In the recent past these culverts have caused significant runoff into the properties at the old Denby Dale school below and adjacent to the site and the developer of the Springhead Gardens site had to intervene. In depth investigations and mitigation works would need to be undertaken.

Would the costs of this prevent this development from being financially viable and if so, we must question if the motivation to secure planning is so the landowner can sell the land with planning permission granted to make a profit on the purchase price, without any intention of developing the site themselves.

Mining

Risks related to mining are known in this area as the Coal Mining authority report suggests. The Springhead Gardens site required significant intervention to negate the risk and as such it would be anticipated that this site would be similar. Considering this application is being portrayed as a single property development how can this be financially cost effective? As above, we are concerned that the land will be sold on and never actually developed as intended in this application.

Site Activities

The site is being classified as a Self-Build; however this should not permit the applicant to work at hours outside of the normal permitted by the council. In fact, it is more important in the case of a self-build that these hours are strict and enforced (and if planning is granted we request that site times be stated clearly in the planning conditions). The site is within close proximity to multiple houses, many with young families and as residents they deserve and should be afforded the respect to have respite from construction works at evenings and weekends.

Conclusion

We believe there are multiple flaws in this application and the disregard already shown by the applicant to the planning process in our opinion should be considered in the strongest sense. Rewarding applicants who disregard the procedures only encourages further transgressions and in the context of a self-build this puts the existing residents at significant risk of continued disruption.