

DCAdmin

From:
Sent: 25 June 2024 22:02
To: DCAdmin;
Cc: Johnjtaylor@kirklees.gov.uk; Cllr Bill Armer; Cllr Richard Smith
Subject: Planning Application 2024/91242 shepley road stocks Moor

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

I would like to record my objection to the above application for the following reasons:

1. Development of the site would be contra to the KMC policy (LP6) on Safeguarded land and the NPPF guidelines for Safeguarded Land.

It is insufficient to argue that due to the lack of a housing site pipeline in Kirklees, published and publicly consulted upon policies should be disregarded.

Section 4.34 of LP 6 states that Safeguarded Land should be 'protected from development during the Local Plan Period, but be considered for development through a review'.

Section 4.35 of LP 6 states that 'consideration of permanent development such as for housing will only occur through a change of allocation through a review of the Local Plan'.

KMC state that a review is underway but has not yet concluded. Determining this planning application prior to the outcome of any review would therefore be premature and contradictory to KMC policy and NPPF guidelines. This would be undemocratic at best.

NPPF guidelines also state that 'Development on Safeguarded Land and the early release of land for housing should only be considered where development constraints can be overcome.' There are significant constraints to development on the site, which the applicant has not addressed, so the application should be refused.

2. Development of the site would present an unacceptable risk to highway safety and render narrow rural roads virtually impassable.

NPPF states that 'Development should only be prevented or refused if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety or residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe'.

The impacts are both unacceptable and severe.

The travel survey prepared for Newett Homes is instructive here. It states that 26 two way (52 one way) and 24 two way (48 one way) vehicle journeys would be expected in peak morning and evening hours. This is of course, the impact during two hours of the day rather than the total impact.

It is difficult to believe that a development with 175 car parking spaces would only create a maximum of 26 vehicles leaving the site during rush hour. Does everyone else stay at home? The principle used in the survey is also outdated (refers to Covid when everyone had to work from home) rather than present when most people are required to work outside the home.

Even if this figure was believable, then somehow, AMA associates, appointed by Newett Homes, calculate that only 3.8% of traffic would use Shepley Road/Stones Wood Road. The underpinning methodology for this is unsound and bears no resemblance to the actual road network, rather a fictitious generic model. There are three points of note here:

3.1% of traffic is predicted to use Fulstone road, which is just as narrow and winding (several vehicle accidents this year) yet no mention is made of the impact of this traffic.

Para 5.37 of the AMA report states 'even if a small proportion (20%) do choose to use Shepley Road/Stones Wood Road, then that is 10 trips in each of the Morning and evening rush hours. This is not significant.' But it is statistically significant. My own travel survey on Shepley Road/Stones Wood Road counted 20 individual trips at peak time therefore the increase over the peak period is 50%, ie highly significant.

Curiously AMA predict 10.5% of traffic would use Stocksmoor Road, which is nowhere near the site. This is not possible.

AMA do acknowledge the existing congestion on Shepley Road/Stones Wood Road by stating that it is unlikely that the additional traffic would use Stones Wood Road due to the likelihood of meeting a vehicle coming the other direction. If that is the case (which it is likely to be), they are acknowledging that any increase in traffic would have a severe impact on the road network and therefore the application should be refused.

No account has been taken of the cumulative effect of this and other applications in Stocksmoor on the local road network. There are two other applications of note here 2023 93658 (1 additional dwelling) and 2019 93095 (10 dwellings). When the vehicle traffic from these developments are taken into account, the total impact does meet the threshold set by NPPF as 'significant'.

In reality here, Stones Wood Road is very narrow, has few passing places and is highly congested throughout the day. Any increase in traffic would render this route virtually impassable.

3. The application does not meet the NPPF guidelines for development.

NPPF states that ‘the presumption is in favour of sustainable development’ and ‘planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits’. The guidelines call for assessment in three main areas. The supporting Planning Statement from Newett Homes is a generic document which could apply to any site in the uk. It contains barely anything relevant to the actual site itself and in no way demonstrates that the benefits of the site outweigh the disadvantages (which are underplayed throughout).

In particular:

Social

‘The development features high quality and accessible useable public open space to contribute to the creation of local communities’. This is a small playground. Stockmoor already has a playground and this new one is only needed because of the development.

‘The development features a design led approach (what development doesn’t) which has been carefully considered to provide high quality well designed and beautiful placement that responds sensitively to the sites setting’. That is just copied from NPPF guidelines and there is no evidence to back up the statement. The application doesn’t even do this, it takes no account of the ancient woodland surrounding the site for example.

Economic

This is even weaker, stating that the benefits are an increase in construction jobs during construction (applicable to any building project) and given Newett Homes are not a local builder it is unlikely that these jobs would benefit the local community. This also refers to a Section 106 payment to KMC which is a statutory requirement for all sites of this nature.

Environmental

The development makes effective use of land (which it has to), delivers a fabric first approach to building (which it is required to do so under Building Regulations) and the reduction of water consumption as much as possible (which again it is required to do so under Building Regulations).

It totally ignores the adverse impact ie loss of important greenfield farmland, loss of local wildlife

habitat, increase in pollution due to surface water run off into the local beck, increase in pollution due to longer journeys because of congested local roads, loss of visual amenity, impact on ancient woodland, etc.

No account has been taken to the 'tacking on' of a modern estate of 50 properties onto a small, traditional local village. This is a massive increase in the size of the village and will change its appearance and architecture forever. The proposed development is a series of properties with uninspired, lazy architecture with few or no redeeming features. They do not relate in any way to the rest of the village and in my view severely compromises the visual amenity of an outstanding asset to Kirklees. The development could be anywhere from inner city London to suburban Manchester.

The applicant has therefore not met the test of beneficial sustainable development and the application should be refused.

4. Lack of consultation with the community

Newett Homes have not published the outcome of their consultation, as required by KMC. The application must therefore be refused unless and until this is done and a full response to local community concerns has been provided.

5. Drainage

The site slopes away from the local foul water sewer. Although a pumping station has been shown on the plan, Newett Homes suggest that trial pits should be excavated to ascertain the depth of the public sewer. The outcome of this can only be that a pumping station is required, given the sloping nature of the site, and the fact that waste cannot flow up flow without assistance. Newett Homes should be asked to confirm their exact proposals for the pumping station, including the noise and extra energy this requires, which should be taken into account in the environmental section of their proposals.

The application form asks if the development would increase the risk of local flooding. Newett Homes answered No to this question. However, the application notes that an attenuation tank of over 800 m³ is required to account for surface water, which would discharge into Stones Wood Dyke. Newett Homes should be asked how this increase in water in the beck would not increase the risk of flooding downstream, particularly on Thunder Bridge Dyke, which does flood during peak rainfall.

Many thanks for your attention.