

DC Admin

From:
Sent: 08 July 2026 22:44
To: DC Admin
Subject: Planning objection 2026/60/91494

Categories:

Good morning,

Application Number - 2026/60/91494/E

Address - Field Cottage Birdsedge HD8 8XP

I am writing to submit my formal objection to the planning application . As a local resident directly affected by this proposal, I strongly urge the Planning Authority to refuse permission. This development represents a severe violation of national and local planning policies, lacks infrastructural support, and will cause irreparable harm to the local community and my residential amenity.

My objection is sustained on the following fundamental planning grounds:

1. Inappropriate Development and Settlement Coalescence (Policy LP19 & NPPF) The application site is located entirely within the designated Green Belt. Under Policy LP19 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapter 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and must not be approved except in "Very Special Circumstances."

Failure to Demonstrate "Very Special Circumstances": The applicant has failed to demonstrate any unique or overwhelming benefits that outweigh the permanent, irreversible harm to the openness of the Green Belt at this location. Housing numbers alone do not constitute "Very Special Circumstances."

The Risk of Settlement Coalescence: One of the five core purposes of the Green Belt (NPPF Paragraph 143) is to prevent neighboring towns and villages from merging. Given ongoing, separate development pressures in nearby Cumberworth, approving this application creates a severe risk of coalescence, destroying the distinct rural identity and physical boundaries of Birdsedge.

Failure to Prioritise the Brownfield Land Register: Kirklees Council actively maintains a comprehensive Brownfield Land Register featuring viable, sustainable allocations for housing—such as Dobroyd Mills (Ref: BLR_045), Lock Street (Ref: BLR_002), and Blackmoorfoot Road (Ref: BLR_025). The Council cannot justify sacrificing protected Green Belt land when the developer has failed to conduct a strict sequential test proving that district housing needs cannot be met on these existing, underutilized brownfield sites first.

2. Severe and Oppressive Impact on Residential Amenity (Policy LP15 & LP24) The proposed development lies directly to the south of my property. By virtue of its positioning, massing, and scale, the layout directly breaches Policy LP15 regarding the protection of existing residential environments:

Loss of Natural Light: Being situated directly to my south, the proposed dwellings will cast a permanent shadow over my primary living spaces and private garden, stripping my home of essential natural daylight and sunlight.

Loss of Privacy and Overlooking: The proximity of the proposed houses will result in direct, unmitigated overlooking into my private rooms and outdoor amenity space, completely destroying my family's privacy contrary to Policy LP15 and the design principles in Policy LP24.

Overbearing Impact: Replacing an open, rural landscape with a dense housing mass immediately adjacent to my boundary will create an oppressive, overbearing environment that severely diminishes the residential amenity of my property.

3. Unsustainable Infrastructure and Lack of Capacity (Policies PLP1, LP47 & LP48) The proposal fails to meet the core sustainability requirements set out in Policies PLP1, LP47, and LP48 of the Local Plan. The local infrastructure is entirely incapable of absorbing this influx:

Education Deficit: Birdsedge First School is an exceptionally small, rural village school operating with a total roll of approximately 55 pupils (~11–12 pupils per year group). It lacks the physical infrastructure, staffing, and operational capacity to accommodate a sudden influx of families without forcing disruptive classroom restructuring. Forcing local children to travel out of the village to find school places directly contradicts the Council's own sustainable travel and carbon-reduction policies (Policy LP48).

Healthcare Strain: The nearest GP surgery is already operating at maximum capacity and cannot take on new patients. Furthermore, the surgery is physically inaccessible from this site via public transport or safe, continuous pedestrian walking routes.

Car Dependency and Highway Safety: Due to the complete lack of viable public transport links from this field, the development builds 100% car dependency into the scheme. This will heavily increase traffic volumes onto an already busy Penistone Road, exacerbating local highway safety issues.

4. Landscape Buffer Deficiencies & Lost Biodiversity (Policies LP25 & LP26) Inadequate Mitigation: While a landscaped buffer is indicated on the plans, it lacks sufficient depth to provide meaningful separation. It relies on immature planting that will take many years to mature, providing no immediate or year-round screening. To protect landscape character, a wider buffer with advanced, semi-mature planting is required under Policies LP15 and LP25.

Off-site Biodiversity Failures: The application acknowledges that Biodiversity Net Gain cannot be achieved on-site, relying instead on off-site financial compensation. This approach completely fails to address the immediate, localized loss of habitat and environmental quality for the residents of Birdsedge, running contrary to Policy LP26.

Conclusion

This application represents a textbook case of inappropriate Green Belt development. It threatens the coalescence of Birdsedge and Cumberworth, ignores available brownfield alternatives, decimates the residential amenity of my home, and places an unsustainable burden on fragile village infrastructure.

I formally request that the Planning Officer and the Planning Committee uphold local policy and refuse this application.

Thank you,