

OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION

Application reference: 2026/62/92200/E

Site: Scholes Cricket and Athletic Club, New Popplewell Lane, Scholes, Cleckheaton, BD19 6NN

Proposal: Formation of two outdoor padel courts and associated works

Case officer: Nicole Helliwell

Consultation closes: 28 September 2026

From:

Address: 44 New Popplewell Lane, Scholes, Cleckheaton, BD19 6NN

Date: 8th September 2026

Summary

I object to this application. I live directly adjacent to the application site and my property would be directly affected by it.

My objection rests on six grounds:

1. **No lighting assessment has been submitted at all**, despite floodlighting being an integral part of the proposal and despite the Council's own pre-application advice identifying lighting as a matter requiring detail. The application cannot properly be determined without it.
2. **The noise assessment does not address the impacts that matter**. It omits maximum noise levels during the day and evening; it omits car park and arrival/departure noise entirely, despite the car park lying approximately 10 metres from my bedroom windows — around a quarter of the distance it treats as the worst case; it omits any assessment of gardens and external amenity space; and it relies on a single winter weekday baseline measurement.
3. **The hours applied for represent a very substantial intensification** of the site's use — an increase of around 70% in the hours the site is in operation each week, including 17 hours a day on Mondays and Tuesdays when the club is presently closed. The proposal is also internally contradictory as to what hours are actually being sought.
4. **The traffic management strategy is unenforceable and, on the applicant's own account, will not operate for most of the time the courts are open**.
5. **The parking case is arithmetically flawed**, rests on no survey evidence of existing on-street parking conditions, and would deliberately displace parking onto the approach to a junction which the Council has previously treated as the determinative constraint on intensifying use of this site — without any assessment of the effect.
6. **The scheme removes healthy trees for convenience**, including the very trees the applicant's own ecologist recommends retaining and the screening the applicant's own planning statement relies on.

The application also contains a number of factual inconsistencies which, taken together, should cause the Council to treat the supporting documents with caution.

Relevant policies: **LP21, LP22, LP24, LP30, LP33, LP50, LP52 and LP61** of the Kirklees Local Plan, and paragraphs 104, 115, 135, 136, 187 and 198 of the NPPF.

1. Missing and inconsistent information

1.1 There is no lighting assessment

The Council's pre-application advice, quoted by the applicant at paragraph 2.10 of the Planning, Design and Access Statement, states that the proposal would be acceptable in principle *"subject to details relating to noise, lighting, parking and ecology"* and that *"a sensitive strategy in terms of noise and lighting could be achieved in this location."*

No such lighting strategy has been submitted. The document list at paragraph 1.5 of the PDAS contains no lighting report. The only references to lighting in the entire submission are:

- PDAS paragraph 3.5: *"Floodlights would also be installed."*
- The Padel Court Plan & Elevations (drawing 1155315, Revision A), where legend item 7 reads *"FLOODLIGHTING TO SPECIALIST'S DESIGN"*.

The drawings show four lighting columns per court — eight in total — at **6 metres** in height, with luminaire heads projecting above that. There is no luminaire specification, no photometric data, no isolux or light-spill contour drawing, no predicted vertical illuminance at any residential window, no upward light ratio, no glare assessment, no colour temperature, and no proposed control or curfew arrangement.

The Council therefore has no evidence whatsoever on which to assess a floodlit development in a location with very low ambient light, operating until 23:00 and from 06:00, seven days a week. Institution of Lighting Professionals *Guidance Note 01 for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light* sets environmental zone limits for vertical illuminance at windows and for luminaire intensity, and this location is plainly E1/E2 in character. Without any assessment against those limits, the proposal cannot be shown to comply with Local Plan Policies LP24 and LP52 or NPPF paragraph 198, which requires new development to limit the impact of light pollution.

The applicant's own ecologist also notes at paragraph 51 of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal that *"a sympathetic lighting scheme could be considered"* — a recommendation that cannot be assessed, secured or discharged in the absence of any scheme.

This omission alone is a sound reason for refusal. A condition requiring lighting details to be submitted later would be inadequate: the acceptability of the principle of a 17-hour-a-day floodlit facility in this location depends entirely on those details, and they should have been provided for public consultation.

1.2 The application is internally inconsistent as to opening hours

The submitted documents state different things:

Source	Hours applied for
Application form ("Hours of Opening")	Mon–Fri 06:00–23:00; Sat 06:00–23:00; Sun/Bank Holiday 07:00–22:00
PDAS, paragraph 3.7	06:00–23:00, seven days a week
Transport Statement, paragraph 3.5.4	06:00–23:00, seven days a week
Traffic Management Strategy, paragraph 2.3.1	06:00–23:00, seven days a week
Noise Impact Assessment, paragraph 1.2.4	06:00–23:00

The public has been consulted on documents that do not agree with one another. More seriously, the Noise Impact Assessment has assessed hours that differ from those on the application form. Whichever set of hours is correct, one of these documents is assessing the wrong development.

1.3 Other inconsistencies affecting the weight the documents can carry

- **Site area.** The PDAS gives the site as "*approximately 0.25ha*" (paragraph 1.3) and "*0.1838*" (paragraph 2.2). This is not a trivial discrepancy, because the applicant relies on the site being "*under 0.2 ha*" to argue that biodiversity net gain is not required (paragraph 2.12).
- **Biodiversity net gain.** PDAS paragraph 2.12 states that BNG is not required. PDAS paragraph 5.8 states the opposite — that a BNG report and "*completed Defra metric are provided with the application.*" No such report or metric appears in the submission. The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal refers at paragraph 44 to a separate BNG report, "*ER-8982-02*", which has not been submitted. I ask the Council to confirm the correct BNG position and, if a metric is required, to require its submission and re-consultation.
- **Existing parking.** The application form declares the existing number of car parking spaces on site as **0**. The site has an existing car park in daily use. This misstates the baseline against which any uplift is judged.
- **Height of the development.** PDAS paragraph 3.4 states "*The height of the courts is 4m at its highest.*" The submitted elevations show 6m lighting columns. The tallest element of the development is understated by 50% in the document the Council will rely on for its visual amenity assessment.
- **Planning history.** PDAS paragraph 2.7 states that the site "*does not have any relevant planning history*", and limits its review of applications relating to the Club to "*the last ten years*". Application **2004/60/90418/E3** was refused on highway safety grounds relating specifically to the New Popplewell Lane / Scholes Lane junction — the junction onto which this application proposes to displace parking. Whether or not the omission was intended, the statement of planning history put before the Council and the public is incomplete. See section 5.4 below.
- **Recycled template material.** The Transport Statement's opening page is headed "*Monkhill Triangle, Pontefract — Scoping Note*". The Traffic Management Strategy is likewise headed "*Scoping Note*". The PDAS at paragraph 6.4 states that the proposal "*aims to promote economic growth within the Huddersfield area*" — the site is in Scholes, in the Cleckheaton ward. The Arboricultural Impact Assessment records a Conservation Area check carried out by "*North Yorkshire Council*" dated 10/12/2026, a date in the future and an authority with no jurisdiction here.

Individually these are small. Collectively they indicate documents that have not been prepared with care for this site, and they justify the Council in scrutinising the technical conclusions rather than accepting them.

2. Principle of development: the need for the facility has not been demonstrated

The site is designated **Urban Green Space**. Policies LP50 and LP61 permit its loss only in defined circumstances. The applicant relies on limb (c) of each policy and on NPPF paragraph 104(c): that the proposal is for an alternative sport or recreation use "*that is needed to help address identified deficiencies*" and which "*clearly outweighs*" the loss.

That test requires an **identified deficiency**. None has been identified. The applicant asserts at PDAS paragraph 6.3 that "*There are no other publicly accessible padel clubs in Scholes, with the closest courts being a drive away to the north of Dewsbury and in Huddersfield.*"

This is not an assessment of deficiency; it is an observation that the facility does not already exist on this particular street. The applicant's case is internally inconsistent on precisely this point:

- For **accessibility**, the Transport Statement defines the catchment very widely, claiming that Cleckheaton, Wyke, Low Moor, Brighouse, Bradford and Leeds are all within reach and that "*visitors are more likely to travel further distances*" (paragraph 4.5.2).
- For **need**, the catchment shrinks to the village of Scholes alone.

The applicant cannot have it both ways. On the catchment the applicant itself defines, there is substantial existing and committed padel provision, including multi-court facilities in Huddersfield and Bradford and further courts in Batley and Dewsbury. One operator is expressly marketing a new Bradford site as being "*10 minutes from Batley, Cleckheaton and Gomersal.*"

No playing pitch strategy, no Sport England assessment, no local needs survey and no waiting-list or demand evidence has been submitted. In the absence of that evidence the LP50(c), LP61(c) and NPPF 104(c) tests are simply not met, and the loss of designated Urban Green Space is unjustified.

I would also invite the officer to consider whether **Use Class F2(c)** is correctly claimed. The Transport Statement describes the scheme at paragraph 5.1.1 as "*the commercial development at Scholes Cricket and Athletic Club*", the PDAS describes the purpose as "*increasing the opportunity for extra income for the club*" (paragraph 3.6), and the facility is to be let by the hour through a commercial booking app with keypad entry.

3. Noise and residential amenity

I live in a genuinely quiet location. Existing activity at the club is already audible inside my home with the windows closed, and the club has been the subject of noise complaints on multiple occasions. I ask the Council to obtain the complaint history from its Environmental Health service and to treat it as evidence of the sensitivity of this location and of the club's record of managing its impacts.

The Noise Impact Assessment concludes that noise will have a "*negligible effect*". That conclusion does not withstand scrutiny, for the following reasons.

3.1 The assessment omits maximum noise levels during the day and evening

Maximum noise levels (L_{AFmax}) are assessed **only** for the single hour between 06:00 and 07:00. Paragraph 4.1.1 states the approach expressly: for the daytime period of 07:00–23:00 the predicted levels are compared with the Sport England L_{Aeq} criterion alone, and the sole maximum-level result in the report, at paragraph 4.3.3, concerns levels within a bedroom at night.

The omission goes further than the assessment. Table 3.2 reports the measured baseline for both periods. For 06:00–07:00 it gives 50 dB L_{Aeq} and 77 dB L_{AFmax} . For the 16-hour daytime period, the L_{AFmax} column contains only a dash: **no daytime maximum noise level was measured at all**.

That is significant, because the report's headline conclusion rests on it. Paragraph 4.3.4 states that the predicted levels are "*well below the prevailing L_{Aeq} and L_{AFmax} noise levels measured during the survey*", and concludes on that basis that the effect would be negligible. For the daytime and evening periods that comparison cannot be made from the report's own data, because the daytime prevailing L_{AFmax} was never measured. A general conclusion has been drawn from evidence that exists for one hour out of seventeen.

The nearest habitable rooms are 37 metres away. An assessment that does not report a single maximum noise level for the 16 hours of the day when the courts will be busiest cannot support a conclusion of

"negligible effect", and gives the Council no basis on which to assess disturbance during the evening period, when people are relaxing at home and putting children to bed.

3.2 The night-time margin is inside the model's own error band

For 06:00–07:00 the report predicts an internal bedroom L_{AFmax} of 42 dB against the WHO criterion of 45 dB — a margin of **3 dB**. The modelling method used, ISO 9613-2, carries a generally accepted accuracy of the order of ± 3 dB over these distances. The predicted compliance therefore falls entirely within the model's own margin of uncertainty, and this is on a worst-case source level that the report itself flags.

The margin is further eroded by the report's assumption of a **15 dB** reduction for a *partially* open window. My household sleeps with bedroom windows fully open in warmer months, which is when the courts will be most used. A fully open window typically affords appreciably less attenuation than a partially open one. On that basis the WHO criterion would be exceeded rather than met.

3.3 The assessment ignores the noise the development actually generates

The assessment models **only the two courts**. It does not assess:

- **Car park noise** — vehicle movements, engines, doors, boots, alarms and conversation, in a car park in use from 06:00 and at 23:00. The Transport Statement predicts up to **27 arrivals and 27 departures** at peak. None of this appears anywhere in the acoustic model.
- **Activity outside the assessed hours**. The assessment stops at 23:00, but a session ending at 23:00 generates departures, car doors and engine noise from 23:00 onwards — squarely within the night-time period, and entirely unassessed.
- **Cumulative effects** with the existing cricket, football and clubhouse uses, which the applicant expressly intends should run concurrently.
- **External amenity space**. BS 8233 gives guideline values for gardens and outdoor living areas. Neither my garden nor any other has been assessed. Residents' use of their gardens on summer evenings is exactly what will be affected.
- **Other receptors**. Only 7 New Popplewell Lane has been modelled, on the assumption that all other properties are further away and therefore quieter. That reasoning ignores differences in orientation, screening, topography and floor level between properties.

The omission of car park noise is not a technical nicety, and it exposes a flaw in how the assessment selected its receptor. The report models one property on the reasoning that every other property is further from the courts and so *"likely to be exposed to lower noise levels than those predicted in this assessment."* That reasoning holds only for the courts. It does not hold for the car park, which occupies a different part of the site along a different boundary.

My own bedroom windows are approximately 10 metres from the car park — roughly a quarter of the 37 metres the assessment adopts as its worst case. Car doors, boot lids, engines, alarms and conversation at that distance, at 06:00 and after 23:00, are exactly the events that wake people. They have not been assessed at any receptor, at any distance, in any period. The property most exposed to the development's most disturbing noise source has not been assessed at all.

3.4 The baseline is unrepresentative

The baseline is a **single 24-hour unattended measurement beginning at 15:45 on Tuesday 24 February 2026** — one winter weekday, at a location described as *"dominated by distant road traffic"*.

The impacts complained of will occur on summer evenings and weekends, with windows open, when the true residual background at my property is far lower than a February weekday. The report's key comparative argument at paragraph 4.3.4 — that padel noise is *"well below the prevailing"* levels — rests

entirely on this single unrepresentative measurement. A minimum of one week's monitoring covering a summer weekend, at the affected façades rather than at a proxy location, would be the appropriate basis for a judgement of this kind.

3.5 No correction has been applied for acoustic character

The report acknowledges at paragraph 2.1.1 that there is **no specific noise guidance for padel courts** and that it has instead borrowed Sport England's guidance for *artificial grass pitches* — football and hockey — as a proxy. Those sports do not produce the repetitive high-frequency impulsive impacts that characterise padel and that are the subject of well-documented complaints at padel facilities across the country.

Having adopted a proxy standard, the assessment then applies **no correction whatsoever** for the impulsive and tonal character of the noise. I request that the Council's Environmental Health officer be asked to advise specifically on whether an acoustic character correction and an evening-period maximum-level assessment are required before this application is determined.

There is a further reason for caution about a conclusion that no mitigation is required. At Barnt Green Sports Club near Bromsgrove, padel courts built with the benefit of planning permission became the subject of a statutory nuisance abatement notice served by the local authority following complaints from neighbouring residents, and the nuisance finding was subsequently upheld by the magistrates' court. It was reported that the club's position was that noise from the courts was not in excess of what its planning approval allowed, and that it had already reduced the courts' operating hours to limit early morning and evening activity.

The relevance here is not that another authority reached a different planning judgement — this application must of course be determined on its own merits. It is that compliance with a planning permission granted on the strength of a predicted "negligible" impact did not prevent a statutory nuisance from arising in practice. That is precisely the conclusion the Council is being invited to accept in this case, on an assessment which omits maximum noise levels throughout the day and evening, omits car park noise entirely, and applies no correction for the impulsive character of the source.

Where a predictive assessment concludes that no mitigation whatever is necessary, and the margins relied upon are as narrow as those set out above, the prudent course is to require mitigation and controls at the outset rather than to leave residents to pursue a statutory nuisance remedy after the event. I ask that Environmental Health be asked to advise on what acoustic mitigation and what operational conditions would be appropriate, on the assumption that the assessment's conclusions may prove optimistic.

4. Hours of operation and intensification of use

This is not, as presented, a modest addition to an existing use. It is a very substantial extension of the hours during which the site operates.

On the applicant's own figures (Transport Statement paragraph 3.5.1), the existing club operates:

Day	Existing	Proposed padel hours	Change
Monday	Closed	06:00–23:00	+17 hrs
Tuesday	Closed	06:00–23:00	+17 hrs
Wednesday	06:00–22:00	06:00–23:00	+1 hr

Day	Existing	Proposed padel hours	Change
Thursday	06:00–22:00	06:00–23:00	+1 hr
Friday	06:00–23:00	06:00–23:00	—
Saturday	12:00–23:00	06:00–23:00	+6 hrs
Sunday	13:00–22:00	06:00–23:00	+7 hrs
Total	69 hrs/week	119 hrs/week	+50 hrs (+72%)

The site would move from being in use for 69 hours a week to 119 — an increase of around **72%** — and from being entirely silent on Mondays and Tuesdays to operating for 17 hours on each of those days. Saturday and Sunday mornings, currently quiet until midday, would begin at 06:00.

4.1 The real increase is greater than the table shows

Those figures compare the proposal against the club's **stated** opening hours. They understate the change, because the site is dormant for the great majority of those stated hours.

In practice, patrons are rarely present before 09:00, and then generally only at weekends. On weekdays the site is often unused during the day; where it is used, this tends to be late morning or afternoon. The baseline that residents actually experience is therefore very much quieter than the table above implies, and the real increase in activity is correspondingly greater than +50 hours.

This bears on the noise assessment as well as on hours. The Noise Impact Assessment's central comparative argument at paragraph 4.3.4 — that padel noise would sit below the prevailing noise environment — presupposes an existing pattern of activity for it to sit beneath. For most of the 119 hours applied for, there is none.

A 06:00 start seven days a week is exceptional for an outdoor sports facility 37 metres from bedroom windows. A 23:00 finish means departures, car doors and voices at 23:00 and beyond.

4.2 Stated hours are not a reliable guide to how the site is actually operated

There is a further difficulty in relying on the hours the applicant states. The club's closing time is frequently not observed in practice: patrons regularly leave the site as late as **01:00**, and the resulting noise — voices, car doors, engines and vehicles manoeuvring — is a serious and recurrent disturbance. This is most acute when the clubhouse has been let out for a private function. These are not events residents have come to accept as an unremarkable part of the background; they are the subject of complaint.

I raise this not as an enforcement matter but because it goes directly to the weight the Council can place on the applicant's assurances in this application. The entire amenity case rests on the operator observing stated hours, and on staff and volunteers implementing a traffic management strategy. If stated hours are not observed at present — on a site that has a clubhouse and staff present — there is no basis for confidence that they would be observed at an unstaffed facility accessed by keypad and booked through an app.

I would ask the Council to seek the comments of its **Licensing** and **Environmental Health** services on the terms of any licence held by the club, and on its record of compliance, before this application is determined.

If the Council is minded to approve, I ask that hours be restricted by condition to no earlier than 09:00 and no later than 20:00, with no floodlit use, and that the hours be secured on the face of the permission rather than left to the booking app.

5. Highway safety, parking and the deliverability of the mitigation

5.1 The traffic management strategy will not operate for most of the time the courts are open

The Traffic Management Strategy is the sole mitigation offered for parking impacts. It states at paragraph 1.1.2 that it *"will be conditioned to the planning approval"*. It cannot bear that weight.

The strategy relies on staff and volunteers monitoring the car park and directing vehicles. But by the applicant's own account:

- Car park attendants are provided **"On match days"** only (TMS paragraph 3.1.6). Matches occupy Saturday afternoons in cricket season and Sunday mornings in football season — a small fraction of 119 hours a week.
- Drop-offs are to be *"managed by volunteers"* (TMS paragraph 3.1.8). No number, no hours, no rota, no training and no funding is specified. The club has **three to four staff** in total (Transport Statement paragraph 3.6.8).
- Critically, the Traffic Management Strategy confirms at paragraph 2.3.1 that *"access can be granted when the club is closed as this will be done via a keypad."*

The courts are therefore designed to operate **unsupervised**, by app booking and keypad entry, at exactly the times when the club is shut — including all day Monday and Tuesday, and every morning and late evening. During those hours there will be nobody on site to direct anyone anywhere.

A condition must be precise, enforceable and reasonable. A strategy that depends on unnamed, unfunded volunteers who will be absent for most operating hours meets none of those tests. It also misnames the road to which vehicles are to be directed, referring variously to "Scholes Lane", "Scholes Road", "B6120 Scholes Road" and "B1620 Scholes Road".

There is no realistic mechanism to prevent parking on New Popplewell Lane. Patrons already park on the lane at present, including when spaces are available on site. Nothing in this application changes the incentives, and no physical measure or traffic regulation order is proposed.

5.2 The parking arithmetic does not work

The Transport Statement states that 8 of the 29 spaces will be reserved for padel, *"leaving 21 for the remaining uses of the Site."* That figure is wrong, because it counts restricted bays as if they were generally available. Reading the Car Parking Layout drawing:

- 5 bays are **accessible bays** (12, 13, 14, 28, 29)
- 4 bays are marked **"ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING ONLY"** (24, 25, 26, 27)
- 8 bays are **reserved for padel**

That leaves **12 unrestricted spaces** for cricket, football, staff, spectators, deliveries and clubhouse users — not 21. On the applicant's own peak figure of 54 users on Saturdays and Sundays, overspill onto the surrounding streets is not a risk to be managed; it is the inevitable outcome of the layout.

It is also unclear whether the scheme increases usable parking at all. **No drawing of the existing car park has been submitted**, and the application form declares the existing number of spaces as zero. The Council

therefore has no baseline against which to judge the proposal. My own observation is that formalising the car park into marked bays — 5 of them accessible bays, 4 electric-vehicle-charging bays and 8 reserved for padel — is likely to *reduce* the number of spaces freely available to ordinary club users compared with the informal parking that takes place at present. The applicant should be required to submit an existing-layout drawing and a like-for-like comparison of usable, unrestricted capacity before and after.

Nor is the "requirement of 20 spaces" evidenced. The Transport Statement describes it as a "*first principles car parking occupancy survey*" (paragraph 5.1.6), but no survey was carried out — it is a desk calculation, said to be "*based on a comparable survey that was undertaken at a padel site*" which is not named, dated, located or appended. It cannot be checked.

5.3 No survey of existing on-street conditions was undertaken

The Traffic Management Strategy asserts at paragraph 3.1.3 that "*there is plenty of on-street parking available on the B6120 Scholes Road. There are no parking restrictions in place, and the carriageway is sufficiently wide to accommodate on-street parking without impeding traffic flow.*"

No parking beat survey, occupancy survey or capacity assessment supports any part of that statement.

It is an assertion. Parking on Scholes Lane is already heavily used, particularly at weekends and in summer, and already causes congestion and conflict with oncoming traffic. Directing further displaced parking there is not mitigation; it exports the problem onto a B-class road.

The 140m walk from Scholes Lane to the site is also unlikely to be attractive to players carrying kit at 22:30 on a wet night, and the assumption that they will accept it — "*Given the active nature of visitors at the site, it is also considered likely that users would be willing to walk further*" — is speculation, not evidence.

That assumption is in fact already disproved on the ground. Among the vehicles that habitually park on New Popplewell Lane rather than in the club car park are those of **the club's own cricket players** — precisely the "active" users the Transport Statement says would be willing to walk further. They do not walk 140m from Scholes Lane today, even when the car park has spaces available. There is no reason to suppose padel players will behave differently.

5.4 On-street parking would compromise the Scholes Lane junction

The Traffic Management Strategy's sole answer to overspill is to direct vehicles onto the B6120 Scholes Lane. New Popplewell Lane meets Scholes Lane at a priority-controlled junction which is the only vehicular access to the site and to the whole of the cul-de-sac beyond it.

Vehicles parked on Scholes Lane in the vicinity of that junction would obstruct the visibility splays on which its safe operation depends, on a lit 30mph B-class road carrying through traffic. **No visibility splay assessment for that junction has been submitted, and the effect of the proposed on-street parking upon it is not considered at any point** in either the Transport Statement or the Traffic Management Strategy. The strategy simply asserts that Scholes Lane is "*sufficiently wide to accommodate on-street parking without impeding traffic flow*", with no analysis of the junction, no swept paths, and no consideration of visibility.

Deliberately displacing parking onto the approach to the site's only access junction, as a matter of policy and without any assessment of the consequences, is not mitigation. It is contrary to Policy LP21 and NPPF paragraph 115(b).

The junction has a planning history the applicant has not disclosed

Application **2004/60/90418/E3**, for an indoor sports centre at this club, was refused. The reason for refusal reads:

"The proposed Indoor Sports Centre would generate a significant increase in the number of vehicle movements, in terms of the frequency of use, and the visibility at the junction of New Popplewell Lane with Scholes Lane is extremely poor in both directions. It is considered that any increase in use of this junction will result in a material increase in danger to road users as such conflicting with the requirements of Councils UDP policy T10."

I should be straightforward with the Council about the weight this carries. **The junction has changed materially since 2004.** A building on the corner was demolished and the junction was widened. I do not suggest that the 2004 finding on visibility can simply be read across to conditions as they are today, and I am not asking the Council to treat this application as though nothing has changed.

What follows from the history is narrower than that, but it is not answered anywhere in this application:

First, the Council has previously treated this junction as the determinative constraint on intensifying use of this site. That is precisely why it should have been disclosed, and why the complete absence of any junction assessment from this submission is conspicuous. An applicant proposing to increase the frequency of use of an access which has previously been refused on visibility grounds might reasonably be expected to demonstrate that the constraint has been resolved. This applicant has not mentioned it.

Second, the widening addressed the junction's geometry. It did not make the junction immune to obstruction. The Traffic Management Strategy proposes, as a matter of design and not merely as an anticipated overspill, to park vehicles **on Scholes Lane itself**. Whatever visibility the improved junction now achieves, vehicles parked on its approaches will reduce it. That is the specific effect requiring assessment here, and it is the one effect the applicant's own strategy makes certain will occur. It has not been assessed at all.

Third, the traffic using the junction has grown since 2004. Further residential development has taken place along New Popplewell Lane, so the number of vehicle movements through the junction is higher now than when the Council last considered the question. The baseline against which any further increase falls to be judged has risen, even as the geometry has improved.

The Transport Statement's reliance on collision data cannot substitute for assessment. One slight collision between January 2020 and December 2024 reflects the junction's current level of use; the proposal's whole purpose is to increase that use, and the strategy adds parked vehicles on the approach. Recorded collision history is not a measurement of achievable visibility.

I therefore ask that the Council's Highways officers be asked to:

1. consider decision **2004/60/90418/E3** and confirm what improvement works were subsequently carried out at the junction, when, and to what standard;
2. assess the visibility splays achievable at the junction **with the on-street parking proposed by the applicant's own Traffic Management Strategy in place**; and
3. advise whether any restriction on parking in the vicinity of the junction would be required, and if so how it could be secured and enforced.

5.5 Emergency and service access

New Popplewell Lane has a carriageway width of approximately **5.0m** near the club (Transport Statement paragraph 2.3.2) and is a 220m cul-de-sac. Vehicles parked on one side reduce the effective running

width to approximately 3.0m, below the **3.7m** minimum carriageway width required for pumping appliance access under Approved Document B of the Building Regulations.

There have already been recent incidents in which residents could not access their properties because of parking on the lane. The Transport Statement does not consider emergency access on New Popplewell Lane at all, and its accident analysis covers only recorded personal-injury collisions to **December 2024** — nearly two years before this application — which by definition captures none of the obstruction, near-misses and access failures that residents actually experience.

I ask that West Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service and the Council's Highways officers be consulted specifically on emergency access to properties on New Popplewell Lane in the event of overspill parking.

5.6 The parking drawing is incomplete

The Car Parking Layout does not show the existing storage containers, bottle banks or gas bottle enclosure on the site, and makes no evident provision for access to them. The bottle banks have already been acknowledged as a nuisance and relocated once within the site as a result.

Until the drawing shows everything that actually occupies the car park, the claimed capacity of 29 spaces cannot be verified — and if any of those features must be relocated to achieve the layout, the noise and amenity consequences of relocating them have not been assessed either.

6. Trees, screening and visual amenity

6.1 Healthy trees are being removed for convenience, not necessity

Trees **T9** (Common Ash), **T10** (Common Ash) and **T11** (Norway Maple) are all classified in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment as **Category C2**, in "**Fair**" condition, each with a remaining contribution of "**10 or more**" years. They are not diseased, dangerous or dying.

The justification for their removal is that they *"would need excessive crown reductions and would be a foreseeable on-going nuisance which would need regular management and could be a potential risk of causing direct damage as they mature."*

That is a statement that retaining them would be inconvenient. It is not an arboricultural justification for felling. The obvious alternative — relocating or reconfiguring the courts so that the trees can be retained — has not been assessed anywhere in the submission. Policy LP33 and NPPF paragraph 136 require better than this.

Sections of **G7** and **G8** are also to be removed for the court and cycle shed footprint, and **G7** and **T6** are recommended for removal *"as part of general site maintenance"* — that is, removals not required by the scheme at all, brought forward under cover of this application.

6.2 The applicant's own ecologist recommends retaining these trees

The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal states plainly:

| *"Trees along the northern boundary of the site should be retained if possible."*

These are the very trees the scheme removes. The applicant has not explained why retention is not possible, and the PDAS does not mention the recommendation.

I would also note that the ecological survey was carried out in **February 2026**, outside the main growing season, and that the surveyor records that at least **10% of the site was inaccessible due to very dense vegetation**, which *"could have concealed evidence of invasive species."* A survey with those acknowledged limitations is a thin basis for concluding that tree removal has no ecological consequence.

6.3 The applicant relies on screening it proposes to remove

PDAS paragraph 6.15 states, in support of the design:

"The trees adjacent to the site form a natural buffer between the residential properties to the south."

The application simultaneously proposes to fell three of those trees and to remove sections of the two tree groups (G7 and G8) that make up that buffer. The applicant cannot rely on the screening function of a tree belt as part of its design case while removing parts of it.

The consequence for residents is direct: reduced screening between the courts, the car park and habitable rooms; a corresponding loss of privacy, including to first-floor windows; and the removal of the visual and psychological separation that currently makes the club's existing activity tolerable. This is a material loss of residential amenity contrary to Policy LP24.

6.4 Replacement planting is not equivalent

The Landscape Layout proposes **ten** replacement trees — 2 field maple, 2 alder, 4 rowan and 2 small-leaved lime — at **3.0–3.5m** height and **10–12cm** girth. Nursery stock of that size will take decades to provide anything comparable to the screening, canopy cover, amenity value or biodiversity value of the mature trees being lost, and in the intervening period there is effectively no screening at all.

It is also notable that the Arboricultural Impact Assessment states that *"as of writing no landscaping details are available"* — meaning the arboricultural conclusions were reached without reference to the landscape scheme now relied upon as mitigation.

6.5 The trees said to be damaging a neighbour's property

Trees **T1, T2 and T3** are recommended for removal on the basis that they are *"causing damage to the boundary wall and a neighbour's garage."*

The owner of the affected property **opposes their removal** and does not accept the premise. No structural evidence, survey, photographs or engineer's report has been submitted to substantiate the alleged damage. The Council should not accept an unevidenced assertion about a third party's property, made without that party's agreement, as justification for felling.

6.6 Visual impact

The permanent structures — two enclosures 20.2m × 10.2m at 4m high in glass and welded mesh, with eight 6m lighting columns — will be a significant and wholly uncharacteristic feature in this setting, particularly once the screening trees are removed. As noted at section 1.3 above, the PDAS understates the maximum height of the development as 4m.

(I do not press the point about temporary tree protection fencing, which is a construction-phase measure. My concern is the permanent structures and columns.)

7. Conclusion

The proposal fails to comply with Policies LP21, LP22, LP24, LP30, LP33, LP50, LP52 and LP61 of the Kirklees Local Plan, and with paragraphs 104, 115, 135, 136, 187 and 198 of the NPPF.

The application asks the Council to accept the loss of designated Urban Green Space, the felling of healthy mature trees, and a 72% increase in the operating hours of a site immediately adjoining homes — supported by a noise assessment that omits the metrics and sources that matter, no lighting assessment at all, a parking case that miscounts its own spaces, and a traffic management strategy that on the applicant's own account will not be in operation for most of the hours the facility is open.

It also asks the Council to permit a significant increase in the use of an access junction which it has previously found to be the determinative constraint on intensifying use of this site, while proposing to park cars on the approach to that junction — without disclosing the planning history, and without a single line of visibility assessment.

I respectfully request that permission be refused.

If the Council is nonetheless minded to grant permission, I ask that it first require, and re-consult upon, a full lighting impact assessment and a revised noise assessment covering maximum levels throughout the day and evening, car park and arrival/departure noise, external amenity areas, and a summer weekend baseline. I further ask that any permission be subject to conditions:

1. Restricting hours of use to **09:00–20:00**, with no use on Sundays before 10:00;
2. Prohibiting use of floodlighting entirely, or in the alternative requiring a full lighting scheme to be approved in writing before development commences, with a curfew no later than 20:00 and demonstrated compliance with ILP GN01 for environmental zone E1/E2;
3. Requiring retention of trees T9, T10, T11 and of groups G7 and G8 in full, with the layout amended accordingly;
4. Requiring a scheme of acoustic mitigation to the northern and western court enclosures;
5. Requiring a revised parking layout drawing showing all existing structures, containers, bottle banks, bin and gas bottle storage, and a re-count of usable general spaces;
6. Requiring a parking beat survey of New Popplewell Lane and Scholes Lane, a visibility splay assessment for the New Popplewell Lane / Scholes Lane junction, and a revised, funded and enforceable traffic management plan covering **all** operating hours, not only match days;
7. Requiring approval of a noise management plan, including a named responsible person, a published complaints procedure, and a mechanism for review;
8. Removing permitted development rights for any further courts, structures, lighting, seating, spectator facilities or amplified sound at the site.

I would be grateful for confirmation of receipt of this objection, and I ask to be notified of the date of any committee meeting at which the application is to be determined.

Yours faithfully,

44 New Popplewell Lane, Scholes, Cleckheaton, BD19 6NN