

**From:**  
**Sent:** 25 June 2024 17:14  
**To:** DCAdmin  
**Subject:** Objection to: 2024/62/91242/E

**CAUTION:** External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To whom it may concern,

I am objecting to the plan to build houses in Stocksmoor. My mother-in-law lives in the village and this plan is already having a negative effect on her well-being. I travel to the village regularly to undertake chores for her, and have done so for many years; so I know the village very well. I also know the adversely negative effect that this unwise plan has.

Here are my objections:

1. Lack of due process. It appears that a decision is being rushed through ahead of a proper process to change the use of the site from safeguarded land in Local Plan 1 ahead of community consultation having been carried out as part of the review of the Local Plan 2 . The sustainability development assessment which Local Plan 1 used as the basis of its allocation is now out of date and should be updated ahead of any Planning Permissions being granted.
2. Lack of due process. There appears to be no impact assessment on wildlife. The proposal has an adverse impact on the adjacent woodlands in terms of the wildlife. From an ecological point of view, you can't separate the woodland habitat from the adjacent open fields. There are Owls, Badgers, Bats, Deer, Hedgehogs and Rabbits. The woodland and open fields are tranquil and beautiful. The woodland and open pastures and meadows are highly valued by villager's. People visit to walk in this area due to the footpaths and green lanes.
3. Lack of due process. The developers Planning Statement points out the development will generate income for the council in terms of Community Infrastructure levy, Housing Bonus, Pre-application advice and Council Tax. This is not a material consideration of the planning process.
4. The impact of the proposal will be severe on a village which is isolated and has a high dependency on using cars, often two to three per household. The Local highways network is inadequate and public transport provision is poor.
5. The proposal is unable to integrate and reflect the character of the village because it is on a highly sensitive self-contained site, on the fringe of the village. The majority of houses in Stocksmoor are built of natural stone and are individual. The smaller newer developments have a large variation in design.
6. The houses which are 2.5 stories high will dwarf and shade the houses on Station Road and are detrimental and obliterate the long standing views of countryside and sun rise.
7. The proposal resembles a post war housing estate. Adding little to the street scene and communal fabric of the village. The proposal makes no contribution to the character of the village. They are repetitive and boxy and there is insufficient variation in the types or detailing. Artificial stone and artificial slate roofing materials are specified. These are not local building

materials. The properties situated closest to the rail tracks are likely to suffer from excessive noise and vibration as there is no buffer zone proposed.

8. The designers seem to have picked the worst elements of the domestic architecture in the village and used that as the baseline for the design principles as opposed to the best. It is not an exemplar development as required in national planning policy if a planning decision is made ahead of the safeguarded land being adopted as housing land.
9. 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.
10. The drainage proposals suggest that some surface water will be discharged into Stoney Wood beck, this flows to Fenay Beck in Thunderbridge. Dam Side is frequently flooded after cloud bursts and persistent rain and continual maintenance is required on the road surface to repair the potholes and erosion of the gutters. This risk should be assessed as part of the Planning Permission.
11. 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 only benefits of an increase in job opportunities are during the construction period and are short term.
12. There are no opportunities to work in Stocksmoor itself, the majority of people commute by car and the few jobs that are in the local area are not accessible by public transport, for example in retail and hospitality, as public transport is radial into Huddersfield and does not connect settlements together. Not everyone, such as key workers, are able to work from home.
13. The site is outside of the greenbelt - only because the Councils LP1 has made it safeguarded land and despite this, it has been /is farmed, used by wildlife and enjoyed by residents and visitors.
14. The proposed development will have an adverse impact on the rural landscape quality and directly on the local biodiversity. The landscape assessment includes a wider area than just Stocksmoor and the immediate site, which leads to a dilution of the value to which residents place on the site and reduces the severity of impact the development will have. Just because an area is not in a national park or other protected status does not mean it's important or has scenic value. The greenbelt around the village is important , it is beautiful and valued by us as an amenity.
15. People drive to Stocksmoor, park up and go for walks. There is even a full time AirBNB capitalising on the attractiveness of the landscape. 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. Plus an increased risk of traffic accidents.
16. The landscape proposals do not provide enough trees and it appears to be low value with low maintenance litter trapping shrubs. This is of negligible landscape value and does not mitigate the replacement of the loss of an amenity and impact on biodiversity.
17. The development will create additional light pollution which will impact on the biodiversity of the adjacent woodland.
18. 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. There is insufficient width for cars and horses to pass cyclists using the Trans Pennine Trail. Additional Traffic generated will increase risks for cyclists.
19. The Transport Impact Assessment and Green Travel Plan are incorrect. There is one train an hour, each way, and one bus every two hours . There is only one Bus Stop in the village with a shelter. The remaining bus shelters 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 settlements where there are amenities. Such as shops, Health and Dental Care, Pharmacy and convenience shops.

20. The Transport Impact Assessment does not mention agricultural Traffic , whose intensity is seasonal or house riding.
21. 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, and within the last 6 months 4 accidents on Fulstone Road / Cross Roads and all involved non-residents speeding. Please check with the Police and your Highways Department.
22. The Planning Report says people are likely to favour using Penistone Road as an alternative to Shepley Road. This is unlikely to happen as most people will use Shepley Road. Plus many Sat Nav systems fail to recognise that Shepley Road and Fulstone Road are single track, which puts extra pressure on those roads. Long and high vehicles are often seen reversing back and there are frequent stand offs between drivers. It is not clear whether the Transport Impact Assessment has accounted for visitors to the new development on social visits or delivering online shopping. It does not take into account seasonality of agricultural traffic, horse riding or trips to take children to school.
23. The suggestion to use Penistone Road as an alternative is a flawed and a dangerous assumption/recommendation. It is accessed by either a very busy and hazardous crossroads from Birks Lane, or via the short cut at Dam Side. Dam Side is very congested due to residents' parked vehicles. Note that on Birks 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 the pub. There is an accident waiting to happen there. More Traffic will increase the risk.
24. The road markings on the cross roads within Stocksmoor at Fulstone Road/Wells House have faded and the priority signage is not clearly visible. 3 of the 4 recent accidents have occurred there.
25. The addition of 50 new homes will also put pressure on school 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 in the car and also serve to isolate the children and their parents from the community in Stocksmoor and Thurstonland.
26. The Travel Plan is generic and unrealistic, and has perpetuated the same mistake made in the Transport Impact Assessment in respect of frequency of Train and Bus services. It promotes the notion that the impact of travel on the local networks will be achieved via residents' home working and having consumables delivered. This is a matter of choice, a behavioural issue and cannot be relied on. The government and employers are now encouraging employees to go back into work to support the economies of towns and cities and this will put more pressure on the highways network.
27. Stocksmoor is so poorly served by public transport and highways connectivity is so poor, that reliance on the car is very high and a temporary travel coordinator will not make a difference in encouraging people to change. The document is contradictory in respect of the health benefits of walking , whilst promoting less movement out of the village.
28. The development of 50 houses is too big. It is increasing the size of the Village by 30%.
29. Transport Impact Assessment and Green Travel Plan seem to be suggesting the Planning Committee should base a decision to mitigate substantial safety risks on behavioural factors which are not quantified or controllable in practice. This is not an acceptable basis to make a decision which is fundamentally unsound and should result in the application being rejected on safety grounds alone!

Yours sincerely,