

Sent: 12 August 2026 12:17
To: DC Admin
Subject: Fwd: Planning Application: 2026/62/91763/E Objection

Planning Application: 2026/62/91763/E
Land off Barnsley Road, Denby Dale, Huddersfield, HD8
Proposal: Erection of 40 residential dwellings and associated works

Dear Planning Officer,

I wish to formally object to planning application **2026/62/91763/E**, for the erection of 40 residential dwellings and associated works on land off Barnsley Road, Denby Dale.

I also have serious concerns regarding highway safety, traffic, parking, the cumulative impact of continued development in this area, the proximity of **Tanner Wood**, and the suitability of the proposed density.

I respectfully request that planning permission be refused.

1. The proposal represents a substantial increase from the recently approved 30 dwellings

The same site was recently considered under planning application **2023/91564**, which proposed **30 residential dwellings**. Kirklees approved that application in May 2025.

The present application proposes **40 dwellings**, representing an increase of **10 homes, or approximately 33%**.

This is a substantial intensification of a site which was only recently considered acceptable at a lower density.

The previous 30-dwelling permission was not an unconstrained approval. It was accompanied by an extensive package of conditions addressing, amongst other things:

- acoustic mitigation;
- noise attenuation;
- construction management;
- biodiversity;
- external lighting;
- replacement tree planting;
- surface-water drainage;
- highway access;
- retaining walls;
- parking and pedestrian areas; and
- biodiversity management.

The Section 106 obligations also included public open space, education and sustainable-travel contributions.

I therefore believe the Council must carefully examine **why an additional ten dwellings can now be accommodated on this same constrained site without creating unacceptable additional impacts**.

The current application should not be treated as though the principle of 40 dwellings has already been established simply because 30 dwellings were previously approved.

2. Particular and serious impact on

This is my principal concern.

The separation-distance evidence deserves particular scrutiny

3. The previous 30-dwelling scheme demonstrates that separation distances were a material design issue

The planning history makes this particularly important.

The approved 30-dwelling scheme was amended during its consideration to address separation-distance concerns. The approved drawing records:

"Plot 22 pulled 1m forwards to provide 21m back to back distance."

The previous planning material also contains a history of changes to the layout specifically to address relationships between proposed and existing homes. The planning drawing records that plots were swapped to allow sufficient back-to-back distance.

This demonstrates that residential separation was not a theoretical issue on this site.

It was significant enough to require the applicant to alter the approved layout.

The current proposal increases the number of dwellings from 30 to 40.

The Council should therefore carefully compare the current layout against the approved 30-dwelling layout and establish whether the additional density has created a more intensive relationship with existing residents.

I particularly ask the Council to undertake that comparison

4. The current layout should be assessed as a 40-home scheme, not simply as a revised version of the 30-home scheme

The applicant's current plans identify **40 separate plots**, numbered 1–40.

The application therefore represents a substantial increase in the number of individual households occupying the site.

This has implications not just for the number of buildings, but for:

- the number of windows;
- the number of gardens;
- the number of people;
- the number of vehicles;
- household activity;
- deliveries;
- lighting;
- noise;
- pedestrian movements; and
- recreational pressure.

The Council should therefore not limit its comparison to whether the overall footprint of the development remains broadly similar.

The relevant question is whether **the additional ten households materially increase the intensity of use and the impact on existing neighbours.**

5. Tanner Wood – Ancient Woodland

Tanner Wood lies immediately adjacent to the development site.

The previous planning process established that Tanner Wood is Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland, and woodland protection was an important consideration in the previous application.

The previous scheme incorporated a woodland stand-off, and concerns were raised regarding works and infrastructure close to the woodland.

The current proposal increases the residential population of the site by approximately one third.

That creates the potential for increased:

- recreational use;
- pedestrian access;
- dog walking;
- noise;
- lighting;
- domestic disturbance;
- trampling;
- erosion;
- construction activity; and
- pressure on the woodland edge.

The Council should therefore ensure that the increased density does not cause additional harm to Tanner Wood.

The current proposal should be assessed against the protection that was considered necessary for the previous 30-dwelling scheme.

6. Traffic and highway safety

I have significant concerns about the additional traffic generated by 40 dwellings.

The previous 30-dwelling application already required detailed consideration of highway access and associated highway works. The permission included conditions concerning access, estate streets, off-site highway works and parking.

Increasing the number of dwellings by 33% inevitably increases the potential number of vehicle movements.

I ask the Council to ensure that the current application properly assesses:

- traffic generated by the additional ten homes;
- the site access onto Barnsley Road;
- visibility;
- pedestrian safety;
- vehicle movements;
- construction traffic;
- deliveries;

- visitor parking;
- parking overspill; and
- cumulative traffic from other developments in the area.

The Council should not simply assume that because the highway arrangements were considered acceptable for 30 dwellings, they are automatically acceptable for 40.

7. Parking and overspill

The application proposes **85 vehicle parking spaces for 40 dwellings**.

I recognise that this is a substantial numerical provision.

However, the proposed development contains **32 market houses**, of which 23 are four-bedroom or larger. There are also four affordable three-bedroom houses and four one-bedroom flats.

The Council should therefore consider realistic household and visitor parking demand.

I am concerned that parking pressure could result in vehicles being parked on Barnsley Road or surrounding residential roads, creating further highway and amenity problems.

8. Noise and disturbance

The previous 30-dwelling permission required an acoustic barrier and completion of the specified sound attenuation measures.

This demonstrates that noise was already a material issue associated with this site.

The current proposal increases the number of homes by approximately 33%.

For an immediately adjoining property the resulting increase in:

- vehicle movements;

- deliveries;
- garden activity;
- household activity;
- pedestrians; and
- general residential noise

could materially affect residential amenity.

I therefore ask the Council to ensure that the current noise assessment specifically considers the increased density and the effect on existing neighbouring properties.

9. Construction impacts

The development would take place immediately alongside existing residential properties.

Construction could involve a prolonged period of:

- heavy vehicles;
- deliveries;
- construction noise;
- dust;
- vibration;
- lighting;
- mud and debris;
- excavation;
- plant movements; and
- disruption to residents.

The previous 30-dwelling permission required a Construction Environmental Management Plan.

Given the amount of development already taking place in the surrounding area, I ask the Council to consider the cumulative construction impact rather than treating this proposal in isolation.

10. Cumulative development

I am increasingly concerned about the **relentless amount of residential development** taking place and being proposed in this area.

There is already significant development immediately around the application site, including the adjoining development of approximately 34 dwellings.

The developer's own consultation material acknowledged that the adjoining site was under construction for 34 dwellings and that the current site had previously received consent for 30 dwellings.

The current application now proposes 40 dwellings.

The Council should therefore consider the cumulative impact on:

- Barnsley Road;
- traffic;
- parking;
- noise;
- pedestrian safety;
- local services;
- public transport;
- drainage;
- open space;
- Tanner Wood; and
- the character of the area.

Residents should not be expected to experience the consequences of development one application at a time while the cumulative effect becomes increasingly significant.

11. Sustainable transport and infrastructure

I am also concerned about the adequacy of local infrastructure and sustainable transport provision.

There is limited bus provision directly along Barnsley Road, meaning that residents are likely to be substantially dependent upon private cars.

The previous 30-dwelling permission included a **£15,600 sustainable-travel contribution**, demonstrating that sustainable transport was already recognised as a consideration for this development.

Increasing the development from 30 to 40 dwellings should therefore prompt the Council to consider whether the sustainable transport measures remain proportionate.

12. Density and character

The application proposes 40 dwellings on approximately **2.35 hectares**.

The issue is not simply whether 40 houses can physically be fitted onto the site.

The Council should consider whether the resulting development is appropriately designed for its particular setting.

This is a constrained site, with:

- existing residential properties;
- Tanner Wood;
- Barnsley Road;
- drainage considerations;
- ecological constraints;
- landscape considerations; and
- existing residential amenity to protect.

The increase from 30 to 40 dwellings therefore raises a legitimate concern that the site is being **over-intensified**.

13. The previous approval does not establish that 40 dwellings are acceptable

I recognise that the previous 30-dwelling approval is an important material consideration.

However, it should not be treated as though the Council has already accepted the principle of 40 dwellings.

The previous scheme was approved following a detailed planning process and was accompanied by extensive mitigation and conditions.

The current application is materially different in scale.

I therefore ask the Council to identify clearly:

1. What has changed since the approval of 30 dwellings?
2. Why are an additional ten dwellings now considered acceptable?
- 3.
4. What additional traffic will the ten homes generate?
5. How does the increased population affect Tanner Wood?
6. How does the current scheme protect existing residents from overlooking?
- 7.
8. Has cumulative development been properly considered?

Conclusion

I strongly object to planning application **2026/62/91763/E**.

The proposed increase from **30 to 40 dwellings represents a substantial 33% increase** on a site where the previous planning process already identified significant constraints and required extensive mitigation.

I also ask the Council to give proper weight to the proximity of **Tanner Wood**, the additional traffic and highway impacts, parking, construction disturbance, limited sustainable transport provision and the cumulative effect of the continuing residential development in this area.

Most importantly, I ask the Council not to assume that because **30 dwellings were previously approved, 40 dwellings must also be acceptable**. The additional ten homes represent a significant intensification and the applicant should demonstrate that this can be achieved without unacceptable harm to existing residents, highway safety, Tanner Wood or the wider neighbourhood.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that **planning permission be refused**.

Yours faithfully,