

Representation Regarding Proposed Residential Development (Hade Edge)

Planning Applications: 2026/91627/2026/91628

Land Allocations: Safeguarded Land SLS17 & SLS18 (North & South of Boshaw View / East of Dunford Road)

Date of Representation: 31.07.2026

Dear Planning Officer / Strategic Planning Committee,

I am writing to submit a formal representation regarding the residential housing applications submitted by Jones Homes for Parcels 2A and 2B on the Safeguarded Land allocations bordering Dunford Road, Boshaw View, and Greave Road.

As a long-standing resident and contributor to the Hade Edge Fight for the Fields (HEFF) campaign, this representation conveys our community's direct insights. In laying out these material planning considerations, I fully acknowledge and respect that the Council's own professional officers, ecologists, and internal departments will already be deeply aware of these structural constraints. We trust that these critical issues are already being thoroughly evaluated as part of your expert assessment of these applications. Our objective is to provide you with our documented lived experience from Phase 1. This reinforces the Council's own rigorous standards of sustainable development and planning accountability.

When evaluating a new phase, the actual performance and unfulfilled commitments of the previous phase provide the most reliable evidence for predicting a scheme's long-term sustainability. I urge Kirklees Council to refuse these applications based on the following material considerations:

1. The Precedent of Tactical Variation and Planning Erosion

Our community's experience demonstrates that the initial plans submitted by this developer for the previous development of 58 houses stand for very little once approval is secured.

- **The "Foot in the Door" Strategy:** Experience with the initial 58-home development establishes a clear operational pattern. The developer effectively uses highly sensitive initial designs as a "foot in the door" to secure planning permission from the committee. Once consent is granted, they systematically submit subsequent drop-in applications, Section 73 variations, and minor amendments to slowly erode the very environmental safeguards, aesthetic promises, and community infrastructure pledges that won them approval in the first place.
- **The Case of the Dry Stone Walls:** A stark, physical example of this involves the traditional dry stone walls that historically segmented these upland fields. During the initial application, the developer committed to dismantling these walls carefully and rebuilding them using traditional, mortar-free techniques to

divide properties and retain the vital rural aesthetic. These walls serve as high-value habitats for biodiversity. However, during construction, the developer renegotiated this commitment away, replacing these irreplaceable heritage and wildlife corridors with standard wooden fencing and brick-and-mortar walls.

- **The Evasion of Central EV Infrastructure:** A parallel, structural example involves the commitment to build a fully integrated, central communal Electric Vehicle (EV) charging hub on the site. While standard, lower-voltage household sockets were eventually installed within selected individual curtilages, the developer quietly used post-approval variations to eliminate the mandatory central charging infrastructure from the completed layout. By doing so, they avoided their wider infrastructure burdens while leaving the local network without the grid capacity enhancements promised to the community.
- **The Renegotiation of Drainage Infrastructure Assets:** Most critically, under application **2018/93372**, the developer actively altered the layout, material specifications, and management framework of the Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and attenuation basins during construction. By shifting the technical parameters and long-term ownership model of these basins, they undermined their environmental integrity. This cost-cutting alteration directly correlates with the system's structural failure today, resulting in severe, unmitigated surface runoff spilling onto surrounding roads. The Council should evaluate these newly submitted applications not on the face value of the promises made in the current brochures, but on this documented track record of systematic post-approval erosion.

2. Encroachment on the Peak District Buffer Zone and Conflict with Ecological Partnerships

The proposal to expand high-density residential development into Parcels SLS17 and SLS18 represents an inappropriate design monopoly that directly threatens the rural character of our settlement and its relationship with a protected national landscape.

- **The Threat of Urbanisation:** This scheme is fundamentally transforming a rural, small-scale farming village—which acts as a key buffer zone to the Dark Peak—into a generic urban landscape. Continuing to duplicate this suburban style across subsequent fields permanently alters the unique look and feel of the settlement.
- **Violation of the Pennine Foothills Opportunity Zone:** Under the Kirklees Biodiversity Action Plan, Hade Edge is designated as part of a critical Moorland Fringe and Pennine Foothills ecological network. The Kirklees Ecology team, working alongside the West Yorkshire Ecological Service, mandates the strict preservation of these fields to maintain habitat

connectivity. Duplicating a dense, suburban estate model across these fields permanently fragments this network.

- **Direct Conflict with the "Moors for the Future" Partnership:** Kirklees Council currently operates a major, formalised ecological partnership with the Peak District National Park through the "Moors for the Future" landscape recovery initiative. This partnership has invested heavily in stabilising upland peatlands, establishing blanket bog carbon sinks, and rewetting the local terrain directly adjacent to Hade Edge. Pushing an intensive urban development significantly closer to these protected boundaries directly undermines this partnership.

3. Direct Conflict with CPRE Directives and the "Hijacking" of Local Planning

The proposal to release Safeguarded Land Allocations SLS17 and SLS18 runs in opposition to the formal directives and past warnings issued by the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) West Yorkshire branch regarding this specific landscape.

- **The Settlement Vulnerability:** CPRE West Yorkshire has explicitly stated that the villages of the Holme Valley are “effectively on the front line in our understanding of the relationship between heavily-grazed upland moors and the future of small, former textile towns and villages”. Pushing a dense, urban estate layout further into these fields directly breaches the landscape buffer that CPRE demands to protect these delicate edge settlements from irreversible urban sprawl.
- **The Speculative "Hijacking" Precedent:** In their formal submissions to the Kirklees Local Plan Examination, CPRE warned that standard planning targets have been “systematically hijacked by the speculative development industry to secure planning permissions that are contrary to the policies of a Local Plan”. Releasing these fields ahead of a formal local plan review entirely mirrors the speculative tactics that CPRE has continuously fought against across Rural Kirklees.

4. Failure to Address Historic Streetscene Density Critiques

The developer's current layout plans duplicate the tightly packed urban spacing of the first development of 58 houses.

- **The Documented Past Objection:** During the assessment of the original 58-home Heather View/Boshaw View application, the Kirklees Council Streetscene and Housing Landscape department formally issued a critical consultation report stating that the layout was visually dense, with houses positioned “very close together with little space between”.

- **Identical Net Concentration:** Despite this clear feedback, a mathematical analysis of the current submissions for Parcels SLS17 and SLS18 suggests the developer is proposing a net concentration of approximately 26 dwellings per hectare. This is functionally identical to the cramped 25.8 dph layout of Phase 1. By splitting the remaining land into separate applications of 17 and 22 homes, the developer is attempting to mask a dense, suburban layout pattern that completely ignores the Streetscene department's past technical guidance on rural village buffers.

5. Upland Environmental Degradation and Domestic Edge-Effects

Forcing an intensive residential boundary further into these fields introduces severe "edge-effects" that actively degrade the delicate ecology of our upland peatlands and native habitats.

- **Domestic Predation and Pollution:** The increased concentration of residential properties directly brings light pollution, urban surface runoff, and domestic pet predation into fields heavily utilised by vulnerable wildlife.
- **Impact on Peatlands and Ground-Nesting Birds:** Increased local population density creates immediate physical stress on the adjacent upland terrain. The introduction of recreational 4x4 vehicles, structural disruption, and widespread cat and dog urine/excrement significantly alter the sensitive soil chemistry of the peatlands and result in a hostile breeding environment for our internationally protected and red-listed, ground-nesting avian species.

6. Aesthetic Incompatibility and Inadequate Material Durability

The standard building quality utilised by this developer is demonstrably below the rigorous standard required to withstand the harsh weather impacts of this specific geographical location.

- **The Challenging Pennine Moorland Climate:** Operating at high elevation, our community faces heavy wind-driven rain, extreme frost cycles, and prolonged exposure. The generic materials and house designs used by the developer are structurally unsuited to this challenging Pennine moorland climate.
- **Documented Structural Snagging and Failures:** This material deficit is explicitly evidenced on the ground by the extensive snagging claims logged by residents within the initial 58-home Heather View development. Occupiers report that standard external French doors warp and jam under atmospheric pressure, while primary front doors warp significantly, creating large physical gaps that let in continuous external drafts. Furthermore, properties have faced severe water ingress and major internal plumbing leaks due to rushed, defective pipe connections—a recurring theme across Phase 1. Utilising these

identical, vulnerable building standards for an additional 39 homes exposes future occupiers to severe structural wear.

7. Atmospheric Pollution and Nitrogen Deposition on Protected Peatland Habitats

The absolute car dependency of this proposed layout introduces a direct, unmitigated chemical threat to the adjacent protected upland ecosystems.

- **The Acceleration Pollution Spike:** Because Hade Edge has limited daily amenities and a declining public transport network, every single resident of these 39 proposed dwellings will be forced to rely on private vehicles. Because of our steep, high-elevation terrain, vehicles on daily commutes operate under high engine loads, creating a localised spike in concentrated nitrogen oxides (NOx) and exhaust particulates.
- **Degradation of the SSSI Carbon Sink:** The Moors for the Future Partnership is currently undertaking a massive, ongoing project to restore the sensitive sphagnum moss networks across the Dark Peak SSSI to counteract years of industrial pollution and structural erosion. Forcing hundreds of additional weekly car journeys directly onto the immediate fringe of this site introduces a direct atmospheric threat. The concentrated vehicle emissions drift straight into the protected habitat, threatening to alter the delicate soil chemistry, choke the slow-growing sphagnum moss, and actively undermine the public funds being spent to stabilise these peatlands as vital carbon sinks.

8. Negative Impact on the Local Rural Economy and Soil Ecology

The loss of these fields directly harms our active rural economy and permanently destroys irreplaceable, high-value agricultural soil infrastructure.

- **Displacement of Tenant Farming:** For generations, the land used for the 58-house development was first farmed by the family who owned it and then leased to a small-scale local farmer for sustainable cattle grazing and hay production, serving as an active part of the local agricultural framework. That land is gone and no longer available to the local rural economy. In tandem with providing terrain to support flora, fauna and ecology as part of the Dark Peak fringe and its protected species, the land for the proposed 22-home and 17-parcel development is fully viable for continued agricultural use.
- **The Asset Liquidation Reality:** The current application does not stem from a strategic, sustainable agricultural diversification plan. Rather, it represents short-term liquidation of assets by landowners. Carving up these active parcels of land disrupts the continuity of the local farming network and fragments the continuity of land across to adjacent farmland.

- **Destruction of Mycorrhizal Soil Structure:** Because this soil remained entirely undisturbed for generations, it has accumulated exceptionally high levels of organic matter and developed a fragile, complex mycorrhizal fungal network. This living soil structure serves as an effective natural carbon sink and a regulator of upland water absorption. Excavating and compacting this land destroys this network completely, increasing surface water runoff and permanently removing productive agricultural land from the local economy.

9. Violation of the "Agent of Change" Principle and Rural Protection

The proposed housing expansion's physical proximity directly threatens an established, operating agricultural asset in the village: the intensive indoor turkey farm.

- **The Threat of Operational Restrictions:** This long-standing agricultural facility has been operational in Hade Edge well before residential development was proposed. Under Section 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the Council must apply the strict "**Agent of Change**" principle. Pushing a dense domestic boundary directly against an intensive poultry facility inevitably introduces a severe operational environmental odour conflict. Future residents will naturally lodge statutory nuisance complaints, resulting in unfair, restrictive operational conditions being forced onto the farmer, despite the business being there first.
- **Acoustic Shock Vulnerability:** Furthermore, intensive poultry populations are profoundly sensitive to structural noise and blast/piling vibrations. Subjecting an active flock to heavy machinery noise right at their shed boundaries presents a severe threat of panic, smothering, and flock mortality. Forcing residential developments onto these boundaries fails the NPPF mandate to safeguard the continuity of the local rural economy.

10. Loss of Species-Rich Grassland and Biodiversity Infrastructure

The low-intensity grazing methods previously used on this land supported a delicate balance of biodiversity that standard housing estate landscaping layouts cannot replicate.

- **Eradication of Flora Margins:** The field borders featured highly established, species-rich flora, including birds-foot-trefoil, harebell, hairy vetch, and native clovers.
- **Impact on Protected Mammals and Raptors:** This habitat supports a highly successful local population of brown hares, foraging routes and, in some cases, nesting sites for bats, butterflies, bees and local bird species (SSSI and red-listed). Replacing this ancient, flower-rich habitat with generic turf

gardens and tarmac eliminates the baseline food chains and safe habitats required to sustain these protected populations.

11. Severe Construction Impact on Residential Amenity and Wildlife Disruption

The noise, dust, and environmental disruption during the construction of the initial 58-home development were exceptionally difficult for existing residents to live through.

- **The "Sandstorm" Effect:** During dry summer spells, the lack of proper on-site dust suppression resulted in conditions akin to living in a continuous sandstorm, significantly degrading the local quality of life and residential amenity.
- **Displacement of Bird Populations:** This intensive industrial noise and heavy machinery activity had a severe, immediate impact on local avian populations. Local observations indicate that bird numbers in the immediate vicinity have not recovered to their previous baseline counts.
- **Unreasonable Cumulative Burden:** Given that the initial development reached completion within the last 2 to 3 years, expecting the village community, the protected upland landscape, and local wildlife to undergo another extensive, multi-year construction phase is an unreasonable and disproportionate cumulative burden.

12. Flawed Traffic Distribution, Intensified Residential Ingress, and Displaced Drainage

The access strategies proposed for both developments introduce a highly disruptive volume of traffic and construction load onto distinct village corridors, compounding the failure of the initial phase's infrastructure.

- **The Boshaw View Through-Thoroughfare:** For the 22 homes on Parcel 2B, the developer intends to funnel all residential and heavy vehicle movements entirely through Boshaw View. This transitions a quiet, established residential close into a continuous feeder thoroughfare, severely impacting the amenity and safety of current occupiers.
- **The Greave Road Junction Creation:** Concurrently, for the 17 homes on Parcel 2A, the scheme seeks to introduce a new estate road junction breaking onto Greave Road. Introducing a secondary point of highway conflict on an exposed, narrow upland route - notoriously hazardous during winter ice and snow cycle - presents an unplanned and unacceptable risk to highway safety.
- **Failing Catchment Networks:** This traffic load is compounded by the fact that the developer's engineered SuDS soakaways from Phase 1 are already failing to contain runoff, creating consistent flooding across Snittlegate, the A616, and Greave Road during routine weather events. To expand this

network across two disparate access routes will inevitably overwhelm the village's fragile drainage catchment.

13. Sustainable Transport, Car Dependency, and the Reality of Social Housing

National planning policies explicitly state that new residential housing should be concentrated close to main arterial routes with robust public transport links. Hade Edge does not meet either of these criteria.

- **The Reality of Car Dependency:** Due to our isolated geographic location, it is practically impossible to live in Hade Edge without a private vehicle. The village lacks basic daily amenities. Every commute for employment, schooling, medical care, or grocery shopping requires a car journey.
- **The Social Housing Disconnect:** These applications include allocations for affordable and social housing. However, independent transport research consistently establishes that residents in social housing rely heavily on public transport and are statistically far less likely to own private vehicles. Forcing affordable housing into an isolated location with a dwindling bus service isolates vulnerable residents and directly conflicts with national planning frameworks.

14. Compounding Strain on Local Educational Infrastructure

The basic social infrastructure is structurally incapable of absorbing the additional pupil yield generated by a combined 39-home development.

- **The Primary School Constraint:** At a primary level, Hade Edge Junior and Infant School is a small, highly valued village institution operating at maximum capacity. The school's physical footprint is restricted; it doesn't have the capacity to build additional classrooms to accommodate a sudden influx of children without permanently sacrificing its essential outdoor play areas and recreational amenities.
- **The Secondary School Oversubscription Crisis:** This strain is severely compounded at a secondary level. Kirklees Council's statutory admission and school census data confirms that Holmfirth High School is operating at its maximum physical limit, with 1,329 pupils currently on roll against an absolute capacity of 1,330. On national offer days, the strict single-year intake quota of 264 places is instantly saturated, forcing the refusal of local preferred applicants. Allowing further high-density residential phases within the catchment area when the regional secondary infrastructure lacks surplus capacity creates an unsustainable and uncalculated burden on local education budgets.

15. Electrical Grid Deficit and Strategic Misuse of Safety Upgrades

The local electrical distribution network has been under visible strain since the initial 58-home development and concurrent builds in neighbouring Scholes were connected.

- **The Phase-Surge Event:** Shortly after those connections, residents experienced a severely hazardous multi-phase electrical surge. This high voltage flooded properties, causing wiring to smoulder inside ceiling fixtures and destroying numerous household appliances. It ultimately required a multi-year campaign and direct intervention from our local MP to force Northern Powergrid to acknowledge that the local network requires fundamental structural upgrades.
- **The Upgrade Misconception:** We are aware that Northern Powergrid is about to commence an urgent network reinforcement scheme to replace overhead conductors. The developer will undoubtedly seek to argue that this investment resolves the site's infrastructural constraints. This is false. These works are strictly remedial and safety-focused, engineered solely to restore basic network stability to existing households who have suffered years of blackouts. It is not a capacity subsidy for commercial expansion.

16. Statutory Avian Non-Compliance, Direct SSSI Threats, and Functionally Linked Land

The proposed sites immediately buffer the South Pennine Moors Special Protection Area (SPA) and the Dark Peak Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), sitting directly within a highly sensitive ecological zone.

- **The 600-Metre SSSI Proximity:** Measuring directly from the southern boundary of the 22-home parcel (SLS17) across the open terrain to the designated SSSI line represents a distance of approximately 600 to 650 metres. This places both applications squarely inside Natural England's mandatory 700-metre Impact Risk Zone (IRZ).
- **The Functionally Linked Land Reality:** This acreage represents undeniably connected land. In line with formal guidance issued by the Yorkshire Wildlife Trust and the RSPB, any semi-improved agricultural grazing pasture within 2.5km of the South Pennine Moors acts as vital Functionally Linked Land (FLL). While SSSI qualifying species—including the Golden Plover, Short-eared Owl, and Merlin—nest within the deep moorland, they rely explicitly on the undisturbed insect populations and open sightlines of these adjacent tenant-farmed fields to forage and feed.
- **The RSPB Urban Edge Effect:** RSPB conservation research confirms that high-priority waders, namely the Eurasian Curlew and Northern Lapwing, actively avoid foraging within a 600-metre radius of modern residential

rooflines due to perceived predator vantage points and unmitigated pet predation. Pushing an intensive urban estate layout right into this 600m buffer zone creates a hostile environment that forces these highly site-faithful species to abandon their historic territories, accelerating local extinction.

- **Absence of Current Multi-Season Surveys:** During the 2017 application (2017/91623), the developer relied on a brief avian survey and argued that because SSSI qualifying species like the Golden Plover were only heard flying and not witnessed landing to feed on the designated fields at the time of the survey, the land lacked connectivity. This argument is entirely invalid under modern UK planning frameworks. No updated, independent, multi-season bird survey has been conducted across Parcels SLS17 and SLS18, which violates the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.

Summary Layout of Unresolved Commitments & Planning Constraints

To assist the Planning Committee, the extensive deficits from the developer's previous phase, alongside the critical material constraints of the current application, are summarised below:

Comprehensive List of Unfulfilled Phase 1 Commitments:

- **Traditional Dry Stone Walls:** The promised reinstatement of historic, mortar-free stone boundaries was post-approval negotiated out for cheap wooden panel fences.
- **Central Electric Vehicle Infrastructure:** The strategic, centralised EV charging points—which required localised grid expansion—were completely bypassed via post-approval alterations.
- **Landscaping Safeguards:** Dead boundary hedging and screening trees within gardens and the soakaway have not been replaced within the mandated 5-year timeframe.
- **Environmental Mitigations:** Mandatory informational flyers to control domestic pet disruption during the breeding season were never distributed to residents; the Council did not follow up on this compliance failure.
- **Public Service Projections:** The developer's assurance that local public services would follow local demand has not materialised, resulting in the reduction or removal of public transport services.
- **Drainage Asset Renegotiation:** Modifying the SuDS attenuation basin specifications via application **2018/93372** during construction, resulting in under-engineered systems and severe road flooding.

Material Planning Considerations Demanding Refusal:

- **Precedent of Plan Erosion:** A documented history of using "foot in the door" tactics and post-approval variations to dismantle agreed environmental and design constraints.
- **Design and Character Incompatibility:** Transforming a rural, small-scale farming village into a generic suburban layout that fails to respect local Pennine architectural distinctiveness.
- **Violation of Agent of Change Protection:** Encroaching residential dwellings closer to an active poultry farm, creating immediate risks of noise, flock disruption, and odour conflict.
- **Inadequate Material Standards:** Utilising standard volume building quality that sits demonstrably below the threshold required to withstand a challenging Pennine moorland climate, as proven by the extensive door warping, draft gaps, and recurring internal bathroom leaks across Phase 1.
- **Failure of Density Guidance:** Duplicating the same dense 26 dph concentration that the Kirklees Streetscene department previously condemned as "too close together".
- **Disruptive Traffic Feeder Ingress:** Funnelling 22 homes through the quiet residential close of Boshaw View and creating an unplanned hazard junction on Greave Road.
- **Atmospheric Habitat Degradation:** Concentrated vehicle emissions and nitrogen deposition drifting directly onto the high-elevation Dark Peak peatlands, actively undermining the ongoing public sphagnum moss restoration project due to mandatory car dependency.
- **Severe Educational Saturation:** Forcing additional family yields into a primary footprint that cannot expand, and a catchment high school operating at 1,329 out of 1,330 total physical places.
- **Peak District Boundary Risk:** Severe encroachment pushing high-density residential boundaries closer to the sensitive Dark Peak National Park buffer zone.
- **Social Housing Isolation:** Allocating affordable homes into an isolated, car-dependent village with a declining, insufficient public transport infrastructure network.
- **Grid Vulnerability and Safety:** Connecting 39 high-demand electric homes to an unstable local electrical grid that has already caused property-damaging phase surges.
- **Loss of Irreplaceable Soil Infrastructure:** Permanent destruction of ancient, undisturbed agricultural land rich in mycorrhizal networks and organic matter.
- **Statutory Avian Non-Compliance:** Direct disruption to the SSSI legal trigger species: The **Short-eared Owl** (*Asio flammeus*); the **Merlin** (*Falco columbarius*); the **Golden Plover** (*Pluvialis apricaria*) across vital Functionally

Linked Land without current bird data. Additionally, the fields support critical red-listed nesting populations of **Eurasian Curlew** and **Northern Lapwing**.

Conclusion

Jones Homes has demonstrated a systemic failure to honour its existing environmental mitigations, landscaping replacements, utility upgrades, and drainage containment targets across their initial 58-home development. Granting further planning permissions on adjacent Safeguarded Land, when the primary infrastructure remains defective and past developer pledges have been systematically bypassed, would be highly irresponsible. The local planning authority has a strict duty to hold developers to account; allowing a further expansion under these documented conditions would fail the test of sustainable development and undermine public confidence in the planning process.

I formally request that this application be 'Refused' or, at a minimum, deferred until Natural England completes a statutory review, a full utility network safety audit is conducted, and an independent engineering investigation is carried out on the failing local drainage and electricity networks.

Kind regards,

Hade Edge resident.

PLANNING NOTICE

KIRKLEES COUNCIL

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE)
(ENGLAND) ORDER 2015

NOTICE UNDER ARTICLE 15

The following planning application has been received which constitutes Major Development and is a departure from the Development Plan

Also

PLANNING (LISTED BUILDINGS AND CONSERVATION AREAS) ACT 1990
NOTICE UNDER SECTION 67 AND/OR SECTION 73
TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (LISTED BUILDINGS AND CONSERVATION AREAS)
REGULATIONS 1990 - NOTICE UNDER REGULATION 5 OR 13
Take NOTICE that application has been made for the following development which would affect the setting of a Listed Building

For:	Erection of 17 dwellings (Use Class C3) together with associated development including access, landscaping, ancillary infrastructure, and parking
At:	land off, Boshaw View, Hade Edge, Holmfirth, HD9 2TZ
By:	Jones Homes (Yorkshire) Ltd
Application No:	2026/91628

Members of the public may inspect copies of applications, including the submitted plans, along with their progress, on the Planning Service website or scanning the QR Code below – www.kirklees.gov.uk/planning

Anyone who wishes to make representations about an application, we strongly advise you do so via:

- the Planning Service website or scanning the QR Code
- emailing DC.Admin@kirklees.gov.uk quoting the application reference number
- in writing (Please note there will be delays in processing these due to disruptions to the postal service and limited staff resources) to Kirklees Council, Planning and Development Service, PO Box 1720, Huddersfield, HD1 9EL within 21 days of the date of this publication*.



All representations should include your name and address. Anonymous representations will not be taken into account. In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000, any comments received will be published in full on our website including your address. If you do not wish your address to be published you should specifically request this and any details in your comments identifying your address will be redacted. Personal data will be processed in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018. For more information about how this data is used go to <https://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/information-and-data/how-we-use-your-data.aspx>

Date:

17.07.26

*or extended period by one day for each Public Holiday occurring within the consultation period.

THIS IS A LEGAL NOTICE POSTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH PLANNING REGULATIONS. PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE BEFORE THE EXPIRY DATE.

PLANNING NOTICE

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE)
(ENGLAND) ORDER 2015

NOTICE UNDER ARTICLE 15

The following planning application has been received which constitutes Major Development and which is a departure from the Development Plan.

APPLICATION NO:	2026/91627
DEVELOPMENT:	Erection of 22 dwellings (Use Class C3) associated development including access, landscaping, ancillary infrastructure, and parking.
LOCATION:	Land at, Dunford Road, Hade Edge, Holmfirth, HD9 2RT
APPLICANT:	Howard Gray, Jones Homes (Yorkshire) Ltd
AGENT:	Ben Parkes, Savills (UK) Ltd

Members of the public may inspect copies of applications, including the submitted plans, along with their progress, on the Planning Service website by scanning the QR Code below – www.kirklees.gov.uk/planning

Anyone who wishes to make representations about an application, we strongly advise you do so via:

- the Planning Service website or scanning the QR Code
- emailing DC.Admin@kirklees.gov.uk quoting the application reference number
- in writing (Please note there will be delays in processing these due to disruptions to the postal service and limited staff resources) to
Kirklees Council
Planning and Development Service
PO Box 1720
Huddersfield
HD1 9EL



within 21 days of the date of this publication*.

All representations should include your name and address. Anonymous representations will not be taken into account. In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000, any comments received will be published in full on our website including your address. If you do not wish your address to be published you should specifically request this and any details in your comments identifying your address will be redacted. Personal data will be processed in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018. For more information about how this data is used go to <https://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/information-and-data/how-we-use-your-data.aspx>

Date:

17. 07 . 26

*or extended period by one day for each Public Holiday occurring within the consultation period.

THIS IS A LEGAL NOTICE POSTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH PLANNING REGULATIONS.
PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE BEFORE THE EXPIRY DATE.