

Address: 1 Four Row, Penistone Road, Huddersfield, Hd8 8xp

About the application

Application number: 2026/91494	
What is the application for?:	Outline application for erection of residential development, including associate
Address of the site or building:	Land off, Penistone Road, Birdsedge, Huddersfield, HD8 8XP
Postcode:	

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	No
I would like to object to the planning application 2026/60/91494/E on the following grounds: 1. The planning application for this development has already been assessed by the council and rejected this site (H2582). Kirklees Council has already rejected previous applications on this exact piece of land. The physical constraints and infrastructure issues that triggered those prior refusals still apply to the site today. The applicant has not introduced any new solutions to resolve these long-standing issues. Overturning the Council's previous planning decisions without a change in site circumstances would seriously undermine the consistency of the local planning process. This land was submitted to the Council during preparation of the adopted Local Plan and assessed by its own officers. "Land south east of Birdsedge Mills, Penistone Road, Birds Edge" (1.35 ha, indicative capacity 47). The Council's conclusion was clear: the eastern boundary "does not follow any feature on the ground so does not present a defensible new green belt boundary"; release would leave land to the east "at significant risk from encroachment"; "the site could not be released in isolation"; and "the Local Plan strategy does not include the removal of Birds Edge from the green belt" 2. It's Protected Green Belt Land – Building here is legally "inappropriate". You have to prove you have "Very Special Circumstances" and developer hasn't proven any. Kirklees Council has a Brownfield Land Register like the one at Dobroyd Mills and other urban sites across the region. It is Urban Sprawl and will encourage further developments, loss of openness, the development would significantly harm the character and openness of the area and village. The views over open countryside and surrounding countryside are stunning and the proposal would damage this and harm the impact on the heritage of the Mill. 3. Highway safety and unsuitable access The proposal would significantly increase volumes of traffic and road safety due to access from Penistone Road raises serious concerns. With added cars, delivery vehicles, refuse collection and construction traffic. The application has not demonstrated that safe and suitable access can be achieved. 4. Increase traffic and pressure on local roads The roads in the area would severely be impacted due to the additional traffic on	

The roads in the area would severely be impacted due to the additional traffic on Penistone Road from this development. This will affect highway safety with car dependency. The bus route is very limited and the train station has no links that are a viable option as it is a forty minute walk to Denby Dale from Birdsedge.

5. Infrastructure Impact on local services

The additional demand of this proposal would place a demand on local services including roads, drainage, schools, healthcare and community facilities. The developer would have to demonstrate that this clearly exists, or that necessary mitigation would be secured, the proposal should not be supported.

6. Character, Landscape and visual impact

Residential Development in this site location could harm the character and appearance of the area, erode the settlement edge and have an impact on the visual look which is unacceptable. This site is a rural setting and would harm the openness and impact the heritage of the Mill.

7. Residential amenity

The proposed development would potentially have an adverse effect on the neighbouring residents through increased noise, disturbance, loss of outlook, overlooking and general activity associated with a new residential estate. These impacts should be fully assessed before any permission is granted.

8. Drainage and flood risk

The proposal of this development and the introduction of hardstanding, roads and dwellings could increase surface water run-off. The Planning Committee should look at whether the applicant should be required to provide robust evidence that the development would not increase flood risk on or off the site and that sustainable drainage measures would be deliverable and maintainable for the lifetime of the development.

9. Ecology and biodiversity

The current site proves a haven for habitat and wildlife with Roe Deer, bats, birds, badgers, foxes, owls and buzzards which contribute to local biodiversity. The application should not be approved unless appropriate ecological surveys have been completed and the proposal can demonstrate avoidance of harm, suitable mitigation and a measurable biodiversity net gain.

The 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, this will have no net gain, 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.

10. Heritage Impact Assessment

The applicant has described the impact on Birdsedge Mill as “less than substantial harm”. Whilst described as less than substantial, it remains acknowledged harm to a designated heritage asset and should therefore be afforded considerable weight.

Conclusion

I would like the Council to reject this application on the grounds that this is Greenbelt land and there are no “Very Special Circumstances” for development. The highway safety and lack of infrastructure and the strain this would have on the local area, it would have a substantial impact and harm to a designated heritage asset with Birdsedge Mill, increased strain on local water through floods and drainage issues. Planning has been rejected previously and the circumstances have not changed. It is

not in the Local Plan and as such should be rejected.