

Fulstone Road
Stocksmoor
Huddersfield
HD4 6YD

Date 24th June 2024.

Dear Ellie / Planning Development Control

Re :Planning Application 2024/91242 Proposed Housing Site at Shepley Road Stocksmoor

Thankyou for the opportunity to consult on this proposal.

I would like to strongly object to this proposal for the following reasons :

1.The development is too dense and large in proportion to the rest of the Village.

The development of 50 houses is too large increasing the size of the Village by 30%. The density is not reflective of the average plot sizes in the village. Although the application identifies the whole site as being circa 2.5 hectares, to accommodate buffer zones, attenuation tanks, open space and foul water treatment facilities, the area of development, as detailed on submitted plans indicates the area for development is circa 1.3 hectares.

The immediate area has a residential density of circa 10 units / hectare and as such the scheme should have a residential density of 38 units / hectare.This difference in residential density would be contrary to Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan. While the principle of 20% of affordable housing is welcome, it is disappointing that the 2.5 storey properties and the affordable homes seem to be clustered together as opposed to being dispersed and are being used a buffer zone against noise and vibration from the railway. These properties will also dwarf, shade and restrict the light to the 1.5 storey properties on Station Road.

2. A decision is unsound ahead of the Local Plan 2 Review.

The Policy LP6 clearly states land use will only change through a review of the Local Plan. The current local plan period lasts until 2031. In the interim, appropriate uses for the land may be deemed acceptable, such as agricultural use as the site is a greenbelt.

As Policy LP6 has not been identified as out-of-date, the proposed development of the site for housing is premature and housing is not a use that would accord with the Development Plan (being residential and not agricultural). To allow residential development on this safeguarded land site would be contrary to Policy LP6 of the Development Plan.

The provision of housing on the safeguarded land, that is in place to ensure that the adjacent Green Belt boundary will last beyond the end of the Local Plan period of 2031 would not serve its purpose, contrary to the objectives and requirements of the NPPF.

A decision appears to be rushed through ahead of a proper process to change the use of the site from safeguarded land (Local Plan 1) ahead of the plan period 2031, before any in-depth community consultation having been carried out as part of the review of the Local Plan 2 .

When consultation on LP1 was carried out in around 2017/2018 the risk of the possibility of Planning Permissions being granted due to the failure of a supply of housing land was not made clear. It was not documented as an explicit risk. Had this been so, it is highly likely that there would have been significant objections from this community. By bringing this sensitive site forward, the

council is depriving the community of an opportunity to have been consulted on it's re- designation, a review of the sites sustainability and any opportunities for neighbourhood planning.

Plus the premature release ahead of infrastructure upgrades and improvements, as well as failing to comply with LP6, will put new residents under some strain as they grapple with the disappointment and realisation that there is no credible alternative to using the car to address their daily needs, when they are unable to register with an NHS dentist, they have to wait up to 2 weeks to see a GP and there are no places at the local village schools within safe walking distance.

Further to the points raised above, Planning Permission should not be granted because the adverse impacts significantly and adversely outweigh the benefits and that there are alternative and more sustainable sites including previously used sites (brownfield) available with better infrastructure within the borough and not immediately adjacent the most complete concentration of ancient woodland and associated habitats in the borough.

On this particular planning application the developer's very brief consultation process took place after the application had been submitted as opposed to before, leaving no opportunity for residents to comment and influence the design. At the time of submitting this objection on Monday 24th June the developers Statement of Community Consultation had not been published by the Planning Service.

The Local Plan is now more than 5 years old (since adoption), the contents of the approved 'Kirklees Interim Housing Position Statement to Boost Supply' report (approved December 2023) identified the need to boost housing supply.

The report acknowledges Kirklees currently does not have a 5YHLS it also states that the LPA should produce a Local Plan Review and Update (to establish whether current policies are up to date) by February 2024. This review appears to be on-going with no report in the public realm which further reinforces the prematurity of any decision on the release of the safeguarded site.

Allowing release of safeguarded land to boost supply should not be overriding of the existing Development Plan's principles of sustainable development, accordance with Policy LP6 and its supporting text. 'To ensure the integrity of the surrounding Green Belt is maintained, design is appropriate and highway safety is not jeopardised'. This proposal does not meet these requirements. Further to this, there is no legal requirement in Planning Law to provide a 5 year supply of land, just planning policy and the potential for revenue generation for the Council. The supply of housing land, should not become the justification to build any housing anywhere, without review. Or take advantage of providential land sites during the call for sites process with out due regard to genuinely assessing how sustainable the development is. It is clear from housing completions that there are approximately 5 times more housing developments on greenfield sites (182) than on brownfield sites (57) within the Kirkburton ward in the last 3 years. (FOI ref 36354) Suggesting that greenfield still preferable to brownfield. While ever there are still brownfield sites, destruction of the greenbelt / safeguarded should only ever be the last resort. Note that there 2 very large housing sites in Shepley under construction, so housing completions will increase significantly, putting more pressure on local highways networks, essential services and amenities. Sales of completed properties appear to have stalled and construction of new homes on both sites appears to have paused.

3. The transport network and infrastructure is inadequate.

The scale of the development as proposed would have an unacceptable and detrimental effect on highway safety, negatively impacting the surrounding highway network, contrary to the objectives of Policy LP21 of the Development Plan.

Stocksmoor is not well served by public transport, which is why residents rely heavily on their cars. The conclusion made about the contribution of public transport appears to be a subjective judgement and is not supported by local knowledge or reality. The validity of the Transport Impact Assessment (TIA) requires independent testing and does not form a sound basis on which to make a decision.

The Transport Impact Assessment fails to mention the following points :

The most direct route of travel for those seeking services would be south east to Shepley (via Shepley Road / Stone Wood Lane) highway safety along this route needs to be considered.

The Manual for Streets identifies minimum carriageway widths should be 5.5m. The width of the route between the site and services in Shepley is significantly less than this over considerable sections. In addition, this route is 'unrestricted' in that the speed limit is 60mph.

Policy LP21 states that amongst other things:

"All proposals shall ensure the safe and efficient flow of traffic within the development and on the surrounding highway network;"

The additional volume of traffic the scheme would generate, circa 100 trips, will have a severe impact on the local network, and in particular on Shepley Road/Stone Wood Lane. Shepley Road/Stone Wood Lane is single track for most of its route with only informal passing points and several blind bends, no footpaths and no street lighting. The length of the single track is actually circa 600M not 137M. The TIA underestimates the hazard by 0.5KM and is misleading.

Use of Shepley Road / Stone Wood Lane would result in an unacceptable and severe impact on the efficient flow of traffic on the surrounding highway network, to the detriment of highway safety, especially as the speed limit between the site and amenities is 60mph.

The trip generation does not appear to include delivery vehicles on completion, yet this is proposed in the Green Travel Plan as part of the mitigation to reduce the likelihood of people using Shepley Road / Stone Wood Lane.

The suggestion to use Penistone Road as an alternative route to Shepley is flawed and a dangerous assumption/recommendation. The most direct way to access the A629 Penistone Road if travelling East is actually via Dam Hill Road, and this is a congested narrow residential street with residents cars parked. Many rat runners use this already as an alternative to Stone Wood Lane. The junction at the end of Thunderbridge Lane onto the A625 is hazardous as the sight line looking right is obscured by a hedge.

On Thunderbridge Lane the Woodman Inn has a wedding venue on the opposite side of the road and inebriated guests are often found staggering across the road from the venue to pub. Increasing traffic here is likely to increase the risk of an accident at this location.

The Planning Report says people are likely to favour using Penistone Road as an alternative to Shepley Road. Again this is a reliance on behaviour to solve a problem and is an unsound basis on which to base a decision.

Many Sat Nav systems fail to recognise that Shepley Road / Stone Wood Lane and Fulstone Road are single track, and as it's the shortest route, and direct unfamiliar drivers that way. This puts extra pressure on those roads. Long and high vehicles are often seen reversing back and there are frequent stand offs between drivers.

There have been x4 accidents on Station Road/ Fulstone Road in the last 12 months . The road markings on the cross roads within Stocksmoor at Wells House have faded and the priority signage is not clearly visible. 3 of 4 accidents have occurred at the crossroads.

While there is bus service to Huddersfield via Kirkburton the 341- there are only 8 buses daily from 06.40 until 20.06, with no buses between 11.31 to 14.06 . There is no Bus service on Sunday at all. There is only one Bus Stop in the village with a shelter. The remaining bus stops are completely open.

Public transport is not particularly cheap, even with concessions for a household. The transport system in this locality is based on a historic network radiating out from Huddersfield. As a consequence there is poor connectivity between neighbouring settlements where there are

amenities and services. Such as shops, Health and Dental Care , Pharmacy, Convenience shop and Library. The library is another service threatened with closure.

The train service is unreliable with multiple cancellations, especially in winter. There is 1 train to huddersfield from 06.34 to 23.39 and a corresponding train to Sheffield 6 minutes later. On Sundays this reduces to 10.37 - 2038. The service has been severely impacted by Industrial Action. The train is used primarily by people commuting to work, education and people visiting the village for leisure. As the train is radial, into Huddersfield and Sheffield is of no use for residents wishing to use the amenities and essential services in the neighbouring settlements.

The bus and train time tabling is not co-ordinated and both services into Huddersfield run within 10 minutes of each other. So if you are delayed more than 10 minutes you have no alternative but to wait another 1 or 2 hours depending on mode.

Residents of Stocksmoor educate their children in Thurstonland and Shepley. We visit the dentist, Doctors, hairdressers, convenience shops in Kirkburton and Shepley. While there is a direct bus service to Kirkburton, there isn't one to Shepley. We do not nip into Huddersfield or Shepley for a pint of milk on the bus or on the train . We get into our cars and drive to Shepley and Kirkburton. We use our cars for the school run twice a day. Hardly any residents cycle because the roads are too narrow , too steep and dangerous. Due to the hilly terrain, cycling requires an above average level of fitness and relying on cycling as an alternative to the car excludes the disabled, infirm, elderly, parents with young children or shopping.

Cyclists using the Transpennine Trail tend to be recreational cyclists, outside of the peak hours and tend to be visiting the area. Further to this, the single track lanes of Stoney Wood Lane and Fulstone Road make overtaking cyclists dangerous as the width is insufficient to maintain the statutory clearance. Encouraging and increasing the number of cyclists in the peak hours is therefore dangerous.

Walking to Shepley (1.0km) and Kirkburton (2km) is equally challenging and impractical for anything other than for leisure. Plus there is a risk to personal safety as the route is lonely and women/children are particularly vulnerable.

There is a very long and steep ramp to Stocksmoor train station, which in winter is icy and a slip hazard. Shepley train station is 0.5km from Joss Lane where the Dr's practice is. It is a long uphill walk. This is not practical for disabled, older and infirm people.

With regard to paragraph 5.3.7 it is highly likely 80% of residents will use Shepley Lane, as opposed to 20% in the TIA based on existing behaviours of residents. A recent survey carried out by the Village Association, of residents route preferences revealed that over 95% of residents used Shepley Road/ Stone Wood Lane instead of taking the longer route via Penistone Road.

There are only footpaths in residential areas and designated public footpaths. Shepley Road and Fulstone Road do not have footpaths or street lights after the village limits. Both are single track roads with informal passing points. Additional Traffic generated will increase risks for cyclists and horse riders.

The addition of 50 new homes will also put pressure on schools places. It is highly likely that some children will be offered places in the surrounding schools in Shepley and Brockholes. This will mean extra trips on the single track roads and also serve to isolate the children and their parents from the community in Stocksmoor and Thurstonland.

There is already a problem of cars speeding through the village who are rat running to Shepley and New Mill and beyond. There was a fatal accident in 2001(a 16 year old cyclist) and within the last 12 months 4 accidents, additional traffic will increase the risk.

In conclusion, the TIA is not fit for purpose. It contains several inaccuracies and has questionable veracity. There is a strong reliance on behaviours instead of safe and sound design. Basing a decision to reduce risk on behavioural factors which are not quantified or controllable in practice

is not an acceptable basis to make a decision which is fundamentally unsound and should result in the application being rejected on safety grounds.

The principle that intensification of development will precipitate further investment in infrastructure is also unsound and completely unsubstantiated, given that in the Planning Statement Highways do not appear to support the proposal on safety grounds. "Stone wood Lane is unsuitable for any further intensification in use from the development of; and it does not appear possible to deliver any significant improvements to the road within the highway boundary to address the existing deficiencies" HDM cannot support the proposed residential development at this site".

Green Travel Plan

Travel Plan is generic and unrealistic, for the following reasons. It has perpetuated the same mistake made in the TIA /2019 Sustainability Appraisal in respect of frequency and reliability of Train and Bus services. Given the limitations of the highways network, it promotes the notion that the impact of travel on the local networks will be achieved via residents home working and having consumables delivered. (Are these deliveries included in the 100 trips in the TIA?). This in effect excludes any key workers who have to travel to work and start at specific times and any parents doing the school run. The idea that residents of the new development will also be negotiating their terms and conditions of employment to suit public transport timetables is also unrealistic.

Modes of transport are a matter of choice, a behavioural issue and cannot be relied on to mitigate the impacts. Currently the government and employers are now encouraging employees to go back into work to support the economies of towns and cities. This will put more pressure on the local highways network.

Stocksmoor is so poorly served by public transport and highways connectivity so poor between neighbouring settlements that reliance on the car is very high and a temporary travel coordinator will not make a difference in encouraging people to change. The Green Travel Plan seems to be predicated on a model which may work in an urban area with good infrastructure and Public Transport penetration, but is not realistic or workable in rural locations like Stocksmoor.

4. The design of the development fails to meet the criteria for sustainable development in the NPPF guidelines and Policy LP6 and the Councils LP1 Post adoption Sustainability Assessment.

Policy LP6 in it's vision, objectives and strategy says that, amongst other things;

- Protect and enhance the characteristics of the built, natural and historic environment, and local distinctiveness which contribute to the character of Kirklees
- Promote the re-use of existing buildings and the use of brownfield land to meet development needs and support the regeneration of areas.

There is a significant increase in density of use compared to the neighbouring properties, immediately adjacent to the Green Belt boundary, the layout of the development does not respect the character of the wider townscape and it is clearly contrary to the requirements of Policies LP7 and LP24 of the Development Plan.

This proposal is not an exemplar of NPPF 12. 'Achieving well designed and beautiful places'. It is unable to integrate and reflect the character of the village because it is on a self contained site, on the fringe of the village with no opportunity to form an active frontage, except within the development itself. Adding little to the street scene of the village and making no contribution to the character of the village. It fails to meet the requirements of paragraph 135. (a), 'add to the overall quality of the area' (c), 'are sympathetic to local character , including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting' (d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place' and (e). 'support local facilities and transport networks'.

The houses appear to be of a non contextual standard 'type' design which have been built and replicated elsewhere in the region such as the development at Emley and the development at

Fenay Bridge. The housing units appear to have been simply positioned on the plan to conform to a loop to maximise density and assist with refuse collection. This is a completely different layout to the organic ribbon development which constitutes most of the village. The proposed homes are repetitive and boxy and there is insufficient variation in the types or detailing. It could be a commercial housing development on any site anywhere in the UK, not on a greenfield site, in a rural hamlet immediately adjacent ancient woodland where much of the existing housing stock is individual or high quality design, using local natural materials.

The proposed use of artificial materials also seems to contradict the guidance quoted in the Landscape Assessment and the Planning Officers advice in the pre-submission meeting. "Developments should reflect the local vernacular, using local materials, which add character and contribute positively to the street scape and uniqueness of the locality".

The Palette of materials should be representative of the pennine character of the locality, built from natural stone with variable courses and Yorkshire stone roofing slates (sandstone roofs). The vast majority of homes in Stocksmoor are built from natural stone, with brick being in a minority. In the Planning Statement and the Design and Access Statements - the designers seem to have picked the worst elements of the domestic architecture in the hamlet and used that as the baseline for the design principles as opposed to the best.

There are no bungalows proposed as suggested by the planners at pre-submission stage, along with a greater proportion affordable housing this would be a welcome addition. The listed weavers cottages on Cross Lane ought to have been the inspiration for the development. Stocksmoor and rural Kirklees need more homes for older people and more affordable housing for younger people, plus a greater mix in tenure.

The Councils Sustainability post adoption statement for the local plan sets the following Objectives ;

Objective 3 Ensure that education facilities are available for all - this increase in housing will put a strain on school places and contribute to an increase in trips over an above the 100 already suggested in the TIA.

Objective 4 Improve the health of local people and ensure that they can access the health and social care they need. The local health centres at Kirkburton and Shepley are already stretched and the Dentist in Shepley no longer takes new NHS patients and instead refer to another practice in Lepton. In all cases, travel to the surgery is usually by car .

Objective 10 Secure an effective and safe transport network which encourages people to make use of sustainable and active modes of transport. The proliferation of single track lanes hilly terrain, and increase in trips generated by the proposal means that the highways network is inadequate and unsafe. Opportunities for improvement are limited. Public transport penetration is poor and does not connect to the neighbouring settlements where the amenities and essential services are used.

Objective 12 Protect and enhance the character of Kirklees and the quality of the landscape and townscape. This proposal fails to enhance the character of the village and is detrimental to the landscape and biodiversity.

Objective 14 Maximise Opportunities to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity. This proposal is immediately adjacent an area with Environmental Designation and Local Wildlife Corridor. There is also a unique geology. The site forms part of the biosphere of the ancient woodland and drainage proposals will have an adverse impact on Stone Wood and Feney Beck.

Objective 16. Prevent inappropriate development in flood risk areas and ensure development does not contribute to increased flood risk for existing property and people. This size of this development is over 1Ha and therefore a flood risk assessment is needed. There are historic surface water problems across the village, complex agricultural drainage systems and

an aquifer, all this points to challenging ground conditions and a high risk of flooding during and after the build period.

5. The quality of the supporting information is poor, heavily biased at the expense of its veracity and accuracy and forms an unacceptable basis on which to base a sound decision.

Having read the various pieces of supporting information. I did not recognise the Village or the area. Such is the level of bias and inaccuracy due to the selective and generic nature of the baseline material used. For example an out of date Sustainability Assessment from 2019, deeply flawed Transport Impact Assessment (TIA) unrealistic Green Travel Plan, highly biased Landscape and Amenity Report which failed to recognise the Ancient Woodland.

I am concerned that the following pieces of information have not been requested/submitted at the time of submitting this objection on the 24th June.

(I) Environmental Impact Assessment

(II) Ecological Survey

Landscape and Visual Appraisal.

The Landscape and Visual Appraisal was assessed in terms of value against an entire location with very mixed landscape characteristics and not the immediate area where the value and loss would be felt the most, which leads to a dilution of the value to which residents place on site and reduces the severity of impact the development will have. The Landscape and Visual Appraisal and the Planning Statement both fail to point out that Stoney Wood is Ancient Woodland. The methodology used in the appraisal skews the analysis in favour of the development. At the same time, the assessment seems to negate the inclusion of several sites with Environmental Designations and Wildlife Corridors as identified in LP30 including LWS75, LWS77, LWS80, LWS85, LGS18 and LGS17. The report does not take into account the views of the people who live in the area. Just because the hamlet is not in a AONB or a National Park does not make it of low landscape value and does not justify its negative impacts in planning policy paragraphs 180 (a) and (b).

The open land (the site) adjacent the ancient woodland and Stoney Beck itself form part of same biosphere. As habitats they are interdependent on each other. This became apparent when the paddock on Cross Lane was developed and several mature trees in the vicinity were felled. Prior to this, there was a significant Owl activity in that part of the village. After Stockmead was completed, the Owls moved on, at a loss to the character and charm of the hamlet.

Ancient Woodland

The site is immediately adjacent Ancient Woodland. Based on Gov.UK Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI) Magic Map . The ancient woodland which surrounds to locality of Stockmoor, Farnley Tyas, Thurstonland and Shepley is the most complete in Kirklees and with the proliferation of green lanes, pack horse trails and public and permissive footpaths some of most permeable and accessible. Which is why visitors flock to the area. Open ground both temporary and permanent is an important component of ancient woodland and functioning habitat. Indirect impacts include destroying working connections between woodlands and its edges/open spaces and this can cause indirect deterioration. Reducing the amount of semi natural habitats next to ancient woodland that provide important dispersal and feeding habitats for woodland species.

The increase in pollution due extra trips, light pollution and noise will distrust the habitat, as will the potential changes to the water table the development might precipitate and also changes to the stream bed discharging surface water will cause. For example the SUDS outfall may change the flow on the stream bed from seasonal to continual due to the slow release from the attenuation tanks. This will change the dynamic of the biodiversity of the stream bed, as well as contribute to erosion of the unique geology.

Importantly this development if it proceeds will irreparably change the landscape character of the area and pattern of development in the hamlet. The tranquility, biodiversity and accessibility is highly valued by locals and visitors.

I would question Rural England's 'No Objection' given its lack of independence and high probability of its assessment being merely a desk top exercise.

There has been no consultation with local people to establish the value placed on it and its impact on the loss. The report claims that the site is outside of the greenbelt - only because the Council's LP1 has made it safeguarded land, and despite this, it has been /is farmed, used by wildlife and enjoyed by residents and visitors.

I absolutely disagree that the site as classified using GLVIA 3 as less significant - a lower value landscape. Despite a contradiction in the report explaining that the area is tranquil. People drive to Stocksmoor and Shepley, park up and go for walks. There is even a full time Air BNB capitalising on the attractiveness of the landscape. How can increasing the size of the village by 50 houses (30%) have a negligible impact / minor adverse impact ?. The landscape surrounding the village is tranquil and quiet . Increasing housing and the associated high car usage will impact severely on this tranquility. Not to mention biodiversity and adverse impact of road safety.

According to the landscape proposal trees are proposed, but no quantity is given, the planning statement states that 78 will be planted, the two pieces of information do not reconcile. The remaining landscape seems to be low value with low maintenance litter trapping shrubs whose benefits are talked up. This is of negligible landscape value and does not mitigate the replacement of the loss of an amenity and impact on biodiversity. There are no guarantees residents will not remove the developers landscaping and fell trees. 2 residents on the recently completed Stockmead development felled trees which were planted for public amenity on their properties.

For the reasons stated above this proposal is contrary to paragraph 180 (a) and (b) of the NPPF.

Geo-environmental Investigation and Flood Risk Assessment

A Stage 1 Geo-environmental Investigation and Flood Risk has been carried out. A risk of blasting has been identified. This is not a low impact activity and is worrying given the local geology and preponderance of springs.

The site may have an agricultural land drainage system. This risk is not identified on the Geo-environmental report and poses a risk in terms of abnormal costs and surface water flooding.

There is an existing problem of managing surface water across the village, which has been reported to Highways and Yorkshire water on several occasions and in particular to the rear of some of the houses on Station Road immediately adjacent the site.

The drainage proposals suggest that some surface water will be discharged into a un- named tributary of Stoney Wood beck, this flows to Fenay Beck in Thunderbridge. Dam Hill is frequently flooded after cloud bursts and persistent rain. Continual maintenance is required on the road surface to repair the potholes and erosion of the gutters.

This problem does not appear to be acknowledged, even by Yorkshire Water.

Noise Report

On page 2 of the noise report, it refers to 'infrequent traffic' on Shepley Road/ Stoney Wood Lane , but does not qualify this in any way. As a user of Shepley Road/ Stoney Wood Lane traffic is far from infrequent as it is the most direct route to Shepley and its amenities and used by residents and rat runners throughout the day.

The noise report suggests that maintaining windows closed will mitigate noise from the railway. This is in contravention of Approved Document Part 0 the Building Regulations. It is also mitigation which relies on behaviours to solve a problem, rather than that problem being designed

out. PPG 4 identifies that if proposed noise mitigation relies on windows being kept closed this may have an adverse effect on living conditions, ironically for the affordable housing units.

The noise report fails to address the possibility /impact on the water table/biodiversity and residents of having to blast bedrock which is raised in the Geo-environmental report.

Economic Impact

During construction the proposal will put additional pressure on an already poor road system. With deliveries, sub contractors workforce and short trips to visit local amenities and pick up supplies. The TIA does not appear to recognise this. The benefits of an increase in labour opportunities during the construction period, while a positive will be short lived and as such do not contribute in a sustainable way to the local economy. Stocksmoor is poorly connected with strong reliance on cars despite there being a train station in the hamlet. There are no opportunities to work in Stocksmoor itself, and those in the neighbouring settlements are not accessible by public transport.

The Planning Statement identifies that the development will generate income for the council in terms of CIL, Housing Bonus, Pre-application advice and Council Tax, at a time when the Council faces a multi million pound deficit. While this is not a material consideration of the planning process, it does pose a risk that an inappropriate weight maybe attached to this benefit which is exclusive to the Council.

Further to this, the Cabinet Report on boosting housing land supply states that the Council has declared a climate emergency, this seems a rather random and counter intuitive statement in a report which is encouraging the decimation of the Greenbelt, agricultural production and wildlife habitats, and is unrealistically promoting use of cycling on dangerous roads and a reliance on poorly connected infrequent public transport.

SUMMARY OF OBJECTION

1. Inappropriate development (excessive density that is not in keeping with that of neighbouring development), contrary to Policies LP7 and LP24 of the Development Plan;
2. Would be severely detrimental to highway safety contrary to Policy LP21 of the Development Plan;
3. The site should be retained as safeguarded land for the reasons identified above, and the proposal is contrary to Policy LP6 of the Development Plan and contrary to paragraphs 47 and 142 of the NPP. An approval of the application under the proviso of the tilted balance ahead of the LP2 is Unsound, contrary to paragraph 35 (b). There are other reasonable alternatives, on brownfield sites, in more sustainable locations with a reduced environmental impact.
4. The negative impacts to the Green Belt and ancient woodland and its openness would result in negative impacts which would not be outweighed by any possible benefits that might result from a contribution to housing need. Contrary to paragraph 180(a) and (b) of the NPPF in respect of avoiding significant harm to biodiversity.
5. Stocksmoor is not a sustainable location and the proposals fail to meet Objective 3,4,10,12,14 and 16 of the Post Adoption Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal, which ought to be reviewed and reality tested as part of the LP2 process.
6. The development has negligible economic impact.
7. There has been inadequate consultation prior to the to the submission of the planning application and prior to this on LP1 which is contrary to Paragraph 16 (a) and (c) of the NPPF.
8. A reliance on changes to behaviours is not a sound basis for resolution of design and road safety problems.

I would like to ask that the council request that a independent and comprehensive Environmental Impact Assessment and Transport Impact Assessment is carried out.

Given all of the above points I would like to request that this application is decided by committee. Please take this as notice that I would like to make a representation at the committee.

Could you please let me have sight of the planning officers report and the date of the committee.

If an approval is granted I would like to request that a range of betterments for the hamlet are conditioned and that those proposed betterments are agreed following consultation with the Village Association/Steering Group.

I would request that my personal details are redacted please.

Yours sincerely,