

About the application

Application number: 2026/90452	
What is the application for?:	Erection of dwelling and associated works
Address of the site or building:	Land adj, Lower Common Lane, Scissett, Huddersfield, HD8 9HL
Postcode:	

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	Yes
I object to the new dwelling off Lower Common Lane due to highway safety, residential amenity, ecological harm, and unsuitable, limited access, with reference to the adopted Kirklees Local Plan (2019) and guidance. 1. Highway Safety and Access (Policies LP20, LP21, LP22) The proposed development raises concerns about highway safety. The site has extremely limited access, requiring substantial work to create accessibility. Policy LP21 (Highway Safety and Access) is explicit that development proposals must ensure safe and suitable access for all users. The severely constrained nature of Lower Common Lane, coupled with the inevitable use of large construction vehicles, would force dangerous vehicle movements—such as reversing into or out of the site—thereby creating wholly unacceptable risks to pedestrians and other road users. The proposed access and driveway arrangements are wholly inadequate and unacceptably cramped, clearly failing to demonstrate that vehicles can safely enter, exit, or manoeuvre. This directly conflicts with LP22 (Parking) and the Highway Design Guide SPD, both of which require safe, practical access. 2. Impact on Nursery and Safeguarding (LP20, LP47) A nursery directly opposite the proposed access represents a grave safeguarding failure. Policy LP20 (Sustainable Travel) and LP47 (Healthy, Active and Safe Lifestyles) require developments to prioritise pedestrian safety, especially for vulnerable groups such as children. Lower Common Lane is already congested during nursery drop off and pick up. The	

Lower Common Lane is already congested during nursery drop-off and pick-up. The introduction of construction traffic, especially HGVs, will substantially increase direct risk to children and parents. The application utterly fails to address these risks or provide any adequate Construction Management Plan.

3. Construction Impacts (LP1, LP24)

The excavation required for the subterranean garage will result in persistent, heavy vehicle movements over an extended period.

Policy LP1 (Achieving Sustainable Development) requires that development should not result in unacceptable impacts on existing communities. Additionally, LP24 (Design) requires development to respond appropriately to its context.

Given limited access and proximity to neighbours, construction would cause major noise, disturbance, and disruption, especially during nursery hours, worsening safety concerns.

4. Impact on Residential Amenity (LP2, LP24)

The proposal will cause unacceptable and irreversible harm to neighbouring residential amenity.

Policy LP2 (Place Shaping) and LP24 (Design) require development to respect the area's character and safeguard the amenity of existing residents.

Due to the close proximity to neighbours, especially No. 1 Lower Common Lane, the development will cause severe construction disturbance. The proposed design undeniably creates overlooking issues; large windows will directly overlook gardens, stripping residents of any meaningful privacy.

This is a flagrant breach of policies protecting residential amenity.

5. Ecology, Trees, and Biodiversity (LP31, LP33)

The project involves removing trees, which could eliminate important habitats potentially used by protected species and other wildlife in the area.

Policy LP31 (Strategic Green Infrastructure Network) and LP33 (Trees) require development to conserve biodiversity and protect existing ecological assets.

The ecological assessment presents inconsistencies: while it claims the site is of low ecological value, it also confirms the presence of protected species, such as nesting birds, bats, amphibians, and reptiles.

This contradiction demonstrates that the ecological information is inadequate and unreliable. Removing trees and disturbing habitats will harm protected species and

violate biodiversity policies.

6. Overall Suitability of the Site (LP1, LP2)

The site's severely constrained location and access render it categorically unsuitable for this development.

The Kirklees Local Plan emphasises the requirement for sustainable, well-located development that integrates with existing infrastructure and communities.

This proposal will produce major, ongoing disruption to an already overloaded, sensitive area. The cumulative impacts—including highway danger, ecological devastation, and deprivation of amenity—vastly outweigh any possible benefits.

Conclusion

The proposal flagrantly breaches multiple Kirklees Local Plan policies and fails completely to ensure safety or avoid substantial, lasting harm.

In short, the development would:

Fail to provide safe and suitable access (LP21)

Create notable risks to pedestrians, particularly nursery users (LP20, LP47)

Cause unacceptable construction and traffic impacts (LP1)

Harm residential amenity and privacy (LP2, LP24)

Result in ecological damage and loss of trees (LP31, LP33)

I emphatically urge that the application must be refused for the following reasons.