

From:
Sent: 24 August 2026 19:07
To: DC Admin; Joanna Rednall
Subject: 2026/92344 Formal Objection – Prior Approval for Demolition of 43 Fenay Bridge Road, Fenay Bridge, Huddersfield, HD8 0AY

Categories:

Dear Planning Officer,

I am writing to formally object to the proposed demolition of **43 Fenay Bridge Road, Fenay Bridge, Huddersfield, HD8 0AY**.

I live opposite the property and have serious concerns regarding the proposed demolition, the proposed access onto Fenay Bridge Road, the potential future residential development of the land to the rear, highway safety, wildlife and the cumulative impact of demolition and other works that have already taken place in the immediate area.

1. The stated purpose of the demolition and future development

I am particularly concerned about the stated purpose of the proposed demolition.

The applicant's supporting statement says that demolition of No. 43 is intended to "**future proof**" the site for potential residential development. The documentation also indicates that the land is designated for housing and that future residential development remains an option.

The applicant further identifies the need for a **5.5-metre-wide road, 2-metre footpaths and improved visibility** if the site is subsequently developed for housing.

The supporting statement also refers to the proposed access providing vehicular access to the large field to the rear for "**short, medium and long term usage.**"

I appreciate that any future housing application would need to be considered separately. However, the applicant's own documentation makes clear that future residential development is a consideration behind the proposed changes to the site.

I therefore ask the Council to carefully consider whether the complete demolition of No. 43 is genuinely necessary for the stated agricultural purpose, or whether the demolition and associated access arrangements are principally intended to facilitate or "future proof" the site for subsequent residential development.

2. Existing agricultural access

The applicant states that the existing access is inadequate for agricultural vehicles, particularly vehicles towing trailers.

However, I live directly opposite the property and have personally witnessed **tractors, trailers and diggers using the existing access without apparent difficulty.**

I therefore question the assertion that demolition of the dwelling is essential to provide agricultural access.

If additional width is genuinely required for agricultural vehicles, it appears that this could potentially be achieved by making alterations to the existing boundary wall rather than demolishing the property entirely.

I ask the Council to establish why demolition of the dwelling itself is necessary and whether alternative means of providing adequate agricultural access have been properly considered.

3. Highway safety

I have significant concerns about the proposed access onto **Fenay Bridge Road**, which is already a busy road.

The proposed access is also positioned directly opposite **Peace Hall Drive**, an established residential cul-de-sac.

An improved access capable of serving future residential development could potentially result in a substantial increase in vehicle movements and create additional conflict between vehicles entering and leaving the site, traffic travelling along Fenay Bridge Road and vehicles using Peace Hall Drive.

I respectfully ask the Council to carefully consider:

- existing traffic levels on Fenay Bridge Road;
- the position of the proposed access directly opposite Peace Hall Drive;
- visibility and sight lines;
- the safety of vehicles entering and leaving the site;
- the potential increase in vehicle movements associated with future development;
- pedestrian safety; and
- the cumulative impact of further development in the surrounding area.

These matters are particularly important given that the applicant's own documentation identifies the proposed access arrangements as being relevant to potential future residential development.

4. Previous demolition of No. 45

I also ask the Council to consider the recent demolition of **No. 45 Fenay Bridge Road.**

I appreciate that **No. 45 and No. 43 are separate buildings and are subject to separate applications**. No. 45 has now been demolished, whereas the current application relates specifically to the proposed demolition of No. 43.

However, I believe the previous demolition of No. 45 provides relevant context when considering the potential cumulative impact of further demolition in this immediate area.

The February 2026 prior-approval submission for No. 45 stated that **Middleton Bell Ecology** had been engaged to check the building for bats and birds. It stated that none were found, but also confirmed that an ecologist would attend the site when the roof slates were removed to oversee the works.

As No. 45 has now been demolished, I ask the Council to establish:

- whether the ecological inspection and supervision described in the application actually took place;
- whether the ecologist attended during removal of the roof slates;
- whether any evidence of bats, bat roosting or other protected species was identified during the demolition; and
- whether the Council has any records relating to the ecological aspects of that demolition.

I raise this because the current application for the **separate building at No. 43** again proposes demolition and refers to an ecologist attending during removal of the roof slates.

I therefore ask the Council to ensure that the ecological assessment for No. 43 is properly evidenced and independently considered, particularly in light of the demolition that has already taken place at No. 45 and the other demolition works in the surrounding area.

5. Previous demolition of barns and outbuildings

I have also witnessed the demolition of **several historic barns and outbuildings** in the area.

I have seen previous correspondence from a neighbouring resident at **51 Fenay Bridge Road**, who contacted the Council after witnessing the demolition of these buildings. That resident expressed concern that the works appeared to be connected with the potential construction of dwellings on Fenay Bridge Road.

The resident also reported significant changes in the local wildlife following the demolition, stating that foxes and deer which had previously been present were no longer being seen. They also reported experiencing rats at their property since the works commenced.

I appreciate that these observations do not, by themselves, establish that the demolition caused those changes. However, they demonstrate that previous works

have already generated concerns among neighbouring residents regarding wildlife, disturbance and the environmental impact of development on this site.

I therefore ask that the current proposal is considered in the context of the **wider works and demolitions that have already taken place**, rather than considering No. 43 in isolation.

6. Previous works and planning/enforcement records

I would also ask the Council to establish exactly what planning permissions, prior approvals, notifications or other consents applied to the previous demolition of the barns and outbuildings.

A neighbouring resident previously contacted the Council because they could not find anything on the planning portal relating to those demolitions.

I therefore respectfully ask the Council to establish:

1. What buildings have previously been demolished on or immediately adjoining the site;
2. When those demolitions took place;
3. What planning permission, prior approval or other notification was required for those works;
4. Whether the relevant procedures had been completed before demolition commenced;
5. Whether ecological surveys were undertaken before those buildings were demolished; and
6. Whether the Council's Planning Enforcement or Ecology Officers have previously investigated these works.

If any previous demolition works were undertaken before the necessary planning or ecological requirements had been satisfied, I ask that this is referred to the appropriate Council officer for investigation.

7. Bats and protected species

I am particularly concerned about the potential impact of further demolition on bats and other protected species.

The February 2026 prior-approval submission for No. 45 states that Middleton Bell Ecology checked the building for bats and birds and that none were found. However, the same document states that an ecologist would attend when the roof slates were removed to oversee the works.

The fact that ecological supervision was considered necessary for the demolition of No. 45 makes it particularly important that the ecological assessment for No. 43 is carefully examined.

I would ask the Council not simply to rely upon the applicant's statement that No. 43 is not suitable for bat habitation, but to consider what ecological survey or assessment supports that conclusion.

I would also ask that ecological consideration extends beyond the building itself to include the **wider field, boundary features, vegetation and surrounding habitat**, which may provide foraging or commuting habitat for bats and other wildlife.

Given the history of demolition in the immediate area, I believe it is particularly important that protected species are properly considered before any further demolition takes place.

8. Cumulative impact on wildlife and the local environment

I have personally observed changes to wildlife in the area following works that have already taken place.

The wider land contains fields, vegetation and boundary features which provide habitat for wildlife. Further demolition, access works and potential future development could cause additional disturbance, habitat loss and changes to wildlife movement.

Although the applicant proposes ecological supervision during roof-slate removal, I do not believe ecological consideration should be limited solely to the building proposed for demolition.

The potential cumulative impact of:

- previous demolition of barns and outbuildings;
- the demolition of No. 45;
- the proposed demolition of No. 43;
- construction or alteration of the access;
- removal or alteration of boundary features;
- disturbance to the surrounding field; and
- potential future residential development

should all be properly considered.

9. Effect on neighbouring residents

The site is immediately adjacent to an established residential area.

Further demolition and access works have the potential to cause additional noise, dust, disturbance and vehicle movements and could affect the residential amenity currently enjoyed by neighbouring properties.

The location of the proposed access, directly opposite Peace Hall Drive, is particularly concerning.

The Council should therefore consider the effect of the proposed works on neighbouring residents as well as the longer-term consequences of establishing an access that could potentially serve a substantially greater level of development.

Conclusion

I appreciate that any future application for residential development would need to be considered separately.

However, the applicant's own documentation expressly states that demolition of No. 43 is intended to **"future proof"** the site for potential residential development. It also identifies the need for a 5.5-metre road, footpaths and improved visibility for future housing and refers to the access being used for **"short, medium and long term usage."**

At the same time, I have personally observed large agricultural vehicles, including tractors, trailers and diggers, using the existing access without apparent difficulty.

This raises a legitimate question as to whether the complete demolition of No. 43 is genuinely necessary for the stated agricultural purpose, or whether the demolition is principally intended to establish the access and site configuration required for future development.

I also ask the Council to investigate the circumstances of the previous demolition of the barns and outbuildings, including whether the appropriate planning and ecological procedures were followed, and to establish what ecological assessment and supervision took place during the demolition of No. 45.

Although No. 45 and No. 43 are separate buildings and separate applications, the fact that No. 45 has already been demolished, together with the previous demolition of barns and outbuildings, is relevant to the **cumulative environmental and residential impact of further demolition in this area.**

Given the **highway safety concerns, the location of the proposed access opposite Peace Hall Drive, existing traffic levels, the applicant's stated intention to future-proof the site for housing, the previous demolition and associated environmental concerns, and the potential impact on bats and other wildlife**, I respectfully ask the Council to **refuse prior approval for the proposed demolition of 43 Fenay Bridge Road.**

I would be grateful if this objection and all of the matters raised above could be fully considered before a decision is made.

I would also ask that, where appropriate, this objection is referred to the Council's **Highways, Ecology and Planning Enforcement Officers** for consideration.

Yours Faithfully