I am appalled that there is still an acceptance that the very dangerous bend this proposal is to be built on is deemed safe! None of the resident's fears have been addressed.

Only yesterday, a car travelling at excessive speed, had to swerve to miss my neighbour, who was just below the proposed entrance to the site. She swung into the middle of the road and if a car had been travelling in the opposite direction, there would have been a serious RTA. Local residents are being completely ignored and yet it is us that witness these incidents on an almost daily basis. This makes a complete mockery of the speed survey that was carried out during February half term between 8.30 and 4.30, not taking into account works and school traffic. Anyone who uses Chapelgate will tell you that the measurements that were 'recorded' that day are nonsense. 23.5 Westbound and 26.2 eastbound. The table displaying the results (Job No 21093) shows 'results' from 7.30 am to 18.00. How is this possible if the survey didn't start till 8.30 and finished at 4.30? There is no mention of the local mini bus, delivery vans or any other vehicle. Strange that! Are you really willing to risk resident's lives based on this?

Also traffic surveys should be carried out and I quote 'Surveys should be carried out during a neutral or representative month avoiding main and local holiday periods, local school holidays and half terms, and other abnormal traffic periods. However, there can be instances where a particular period (e.g weekends or school holidays) is of interest, for example in regions with relatively high levels of tourism. The period for the surveys should be selected with careful consideration of the purpose of the transport model.' This survey should have been carried out during a normal day and again over a weekend in the cricket season.

'The traffic generation for the proposed site has been calculated using trip rates derived from Trics.' 'TRICS users undertake trip rate calculations using a number of calculation parameter options (for example Gross Floor Area, Dwellings, Employees etc.) to ascertain potential levels of trip generation for a user-defined development scenario'

They are using data from East Sussex, Norfolk, Surrey and even Ulster. Are you really willing to risk resident's lives based on this?

'1.5.3 A site visit was carried out by the Road Safety Audit Team on Thursday 24th February 2022 between the hours of 10.30 and 11.00. The weather and the road surface were wet Low traffic volumes were observed along Chapelgate and Dean Bridge Lane. No pedestrians or cyclists were observed during the site visit.'

They have come for half an hour on a wet day, mid- morning of February half term. We stressed to EcoHolmes at the original site meeting, that all traffic data must be collected during the long cricket season, (April to end of August) when Chapelgate is a giant carpark, otherwise it is not a true reflection. Again local knowledge has been completely ignored! Who is going to be out cycling or walking in heavy rain? Are you willing to risk resident's lives based on this?

'Pedestrian access to and from the site will be through Chapelgate Road.'

From Oak Scar lane down to the site, there is no pavement, except a small strip in front of No 57, so all these young families that are going to live in these houses will have to walk up a road with no pavement, with an exit close to a bad bend, dodging in between residents cars parked on both sides of the road, juggling toddlers and prams. Are you really willing to risk resident's lives based on this?

Building on green belt is totally unacceptable. I see that the planning officer recommended some changes, some of which have only been partially addressed. I feel the changes EcoHolmes have made to the retaining wall on the western edge of the site is still unacceptable. Yes there will be some grass and plants on a slope at the top, though it will take many years for it to develop for wildlife. The bottom however is ugly and not in keeping with the Landscape Character Area (Settled Slopes of the Holme Valley), which Neighbourhood Plan boundary treatments should be sensitive to.

It is shown to be a Soil Rock nailing & Gabion Basket System. This is a solid retaining wall covered in netting.' Local Plan policy LP32 requires that the proposals should be designed to take account for and seek to enhance the landscape character of the area. LP 24 states that the form, scale, layout and details of all development respects and enhances the character of the landscape. Careful consideration therefore needs to be given to the design and landscaping treatment of any retaining structure, which ought to be sloped and landscaped banks, not solid retaining walls.' Why then is this boundary still showing a partial solid retaining wall on the revised plan? It definitely does not enhance the landscape

The whole proposal is overly urbanised. It does not meet all the policies in the Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development Plan. This site may be regarded as a gateway to our village. The impact of this proposal is too damaging to the green belt!

I am personally fed up of being called a Nimby! This has happened frequently on social media and even in some of the supportive comments. I grew up in a back to back house with an outside toilet until the age of 14, when I moved into a council property. My objections would be exactly the same if a 5 million pound, state of the arc, detached house was planned for this site. It is very insulting and completely untrue that I am against this development because it is for social housing.

Nothing should be built on this piece of green belt land. It should be kept as valuable community space for which it was given all those years ago. It is completely unacceptable that HVPC are now asking residents what they would like to happen to another of these acquired former stone quarry sites, called Swinden Knowl. One of the Parish councillors has stated that it can't be built on as its common land. Why then, weren't the villagers of Scholes and Hepworth asked what they would like doing with this site, and why is this being considered as a building site?

We have found documents showing that there has been a public footpath going through part of the site since 1834. A well used footpath that runs through the site has been used by local residents since at least the 1950s.

I respectfully ask that this application is turned down, before lives are lost.