



I write to object to the Housing Mix Assessment submitted in support of Application 2026/90310 .

The proposed mix is heavily skewed toward larger dwellings, with 49% four-bedroom (or more) homes and 41% three-bedroom homes, meaning 90% of the development comprises 3–4+ bedroom properties. No one-bedroom homes are proposed and only 10% are two-bedroom. This materially departs from the Kirklees Dwelling Mix Analysis (2020–2031), which identifies a far more balanced need, including significant provision for two-bedroom homes and smaller units.

The Assessment selectively dismisses the 2016 SHMA as outdated when inconvenient, yet relies upon it when supporting larger family homes. This inconsistent approach undermines its evidential weight. Similarly, the SPD is downplayed as “guidance” despite being adopted policy support, while reliance is placed on draft national policy that is not yet in force.

The report acknowledges that 72% of households locally under-occupy their homes, indicating substantial spare capacity in the existing stock. It is therefore contradictory to argue that there is a structural shortage of large dwellings. The issue appears more related to affordability and turnover, not supply of 4+ bedroom houses.

The reliance on vacancy chain modelling and overseas academic research is theoretical and unsupported by local evidence. The document itself recognises that older households rarely downsize, weakening the assumption that building large homes will meaningfully release smaller stock.

Given the site is greenfield land, a scheme dominated by low-density larger housing represents an inefficient use of land and fails to demonstrate compliance with policy requirements for balanced and sustainable communities.

For these reasons, the Housing Mix Assessment should be afforded limited weight, and the proposed mix should be considered unjustified and contrary to adopted local policy guidance.