

DC Admin

From:
Sent: 05 October 2025 17:41
To: DC Admin
Subject: Comment (Objection) Application number 2025/62/92591/E
Attachments: Letter of Objection to Change of use Application number 20256292591E_with_past_applications.pdf

142, Marsh Lane
Shepley
Huddersfield
West Yorkshire
HD8 8AX

5 October 2025

Dear Elenya,

Re: **Application number** 2025/62/92591/E – Change of use and alterations to convert existing storage shed into standalone dwelling for short stay use with associated external works

Owning swathes of the English countryside is a privilege that should never be abused. Seeking to exploit the position of land ownership and in so doing diminishing the lives of many for the benefit of a few is such an abuse of position.

We are custodians of the land we may hold in our lifetime, where an individual is privileged enough to own a significant percentage of a village, their custodianship extends to respecting the way of life, health and well-being of villagers impacted by their ownership.

- conservation of buildings and conservation of the natural environment

While respecting it is important to maintain a non-personal position, it is personal when the environment which we call home is potentially going to change and not for the better. In and of itself, this looks like an innocuous request for change of use for a small storage building in the larger curtilage of Marsh Farm. However, there are potentially dire implications of changing its use to 'standalone dwelling'. It would set the precedent for residential property in a position that could later be interpreted as 'infill', on the Green Belt and in a location owned by the applicant who may further seek to develop the large area of the village they own or sell it with any potential purchaser in a stronger position to achieve residential development status.

While no longer a working farm the property in question and the associated land are prime development sites for housing. I will not wander into the implications that would have, if ever pursued. However, this application, if approved, would serve to open that door with impact and potential implications far beyond this simple, change of use, small building development application. Because the application would result in a very small gain for the landowner at a great cost to others, it seems possible that this is simply pushing the envelope, testing the water and there are other, larger gains hidden from sight.

- effect on trees and the landscape
- effect on the character of an area
- noise, disturbance and odour
- conservation of the natural environment

Furthermore, the purpose of letting the property for booking via such platforms as Air B&B could negatively effect on the character of an area in terms of noise and disturbance, impacting the lived experience of those, such as myself, that are directly opposite the proposed development, with noise and intrusion that we do not currently endure in the vicinity.

There is a rich and established wildlife population in particular a white owl and bats who frequent the building and surrounding fields and who would potentially be disturbed and unsettled by the development.

The application appears to originate from people no longer resident in the village (Mr & Mrs Addy) are potentially the residents of Garth Farm, Hambleton, Selby, North Yorkshire with beautiful social media posts under the names [@farmer benjy](#) and [agrimilly](#) These feeds show they enjoy wide open expanses of land without such premises in evidence.

If the council genuinely feels the village of Shepley, which has and continues to absorb extensive residential development really does need such opportunities for visitor development the land owner in question already has a caravan and camping park and outbuildings surrounding the main farm which could be considered and furthermore within a matter of meters is a second home, owned by people who no longer live in the village (not related to the applicant) and it has been un-lived in for some 15 years. Surely if the council was serious about bringing properties into use there are many ahead of the one that is the subject of this application.

The village of Shepley requires affordable housing for people on average incomes before it becomes just another village full of second homes, unoccupied residences with air B&B listings and no soul. Perfectly habitable homes left unoccupied could be brought back into use before we need to start making micro businesses on a site that dominates the village and benefits its owners sufficiently without burdening others to further progress their advantage.

Presumably additional signage would be required and lighting as the area is currently unlit, which is good for the nocturnal wildlife, light pollution would be another negative impact of this development.

The owner of the empty property (which is across the land from the field where this development is proposed) did advise me that they would be very confident, at the time of their choosing, to sell the property they inherited as the garden to the rear offered development opportunities. As there is a tree preservation order in place and the rear garden falls mainly within the greenbelt I was not alarmed, but things change, and the decision made by planning officers can have implications well beyond the small application they are considering. I believe if this application is successful, it will bring no material benefit to the village, has the potential to bring material damage to wildlife and those who live here every day and opens the door to the future devastation of this area of the village. We must trust that these decisions are taken carefully, in the interest of the many and those who cannot represent themselves and their interests and that, on this occasion the small benefit to a single individual can be seen as secondary to the conservation of the natural environment and the nature that lives quietly there.

It is also noteworthy that the beautiful stone walls surrounding the field in question are not maintained, respected, repaired or kept in a cared for fashion, if the objective is to make better use of the land and structures thereon, these matters could perhaps receive attention to reflect a desire to maintain the area.

There is a small CIC in the village who deliver Art at The House, at Cliffe House. A once-a-year weekend where they provide creative opportunities for the whole community and a platform for independent creative practices to showcase their work. They are desperate for storage for the paraphernalia that accompanies delivering this event and unable to afford premises, this would be a far better and more village-friendly consideration for the building in question. Kirklees council states it works to create the conditions for successful vibrant and culturally active places and spaces where social, economic and well-being flourishes. This proposal does not support that.

- impact on highway safety and traffic
- previous planning applications

There have been many refused applications (see attached 2000-93239_+Decision+Notice_256738, 2003-90001_+Decision+Notice_257489, 2013-93209_+Decision+Notice_474298, 2019-93387_+Decision+Notice_784047, 2022-92901_+Decision+Notice_1019363, 2023-90229_+Decision+Notice_980849) which exemplify why this proposal should be considered in terms of harm to the openness of the Green Belt, inappropriate development of the Green Belt, undermine the greenfield nature of the land, access and drainage, dominant and incongruous feature within the street scene, detrimental to visual amenity

The proposed access road, Long Close Lane, is unsuitable to cope with the additional traffic generated by the development due to its width, substandard construction, lack of footways, drainage and service vehicle turning provision. In addition, the regular vehicle use of Long Close Lane by occupants and visitors to this development would lead to its further early deterioration to the detriment of highway safety and contrary to Unitary Development Plan Policy T10. (Decision in part to planning application 2003/60/90001/E6)

The site lies within an area which has received approval as Green Belt within which it is intended that new development be severely restricted. The proposal would be unrelated to any existing settlement and injuriously affect the rural character of the surrounding countryside. Such development is neither appropriate to the Green Belt nor are there any special reasons why it should be permitted in this case or in the future. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy D8 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan. (Decision in part to planning application 2003/60/90001/E6)

The proposed development would result in a disproportionate addition to the original building and would harm the openness of the Green Belt. As such, the proposal constitutes inappropriate development within the Green Belt, thereby contrary to the requirements of policy D11 of the Unitary Development Plan and Paragraph 89 of the National Planning Policy Framework. (Decision in part to planning application 2013/62/93209/W)

The application site is located within the designated Green Belt, whereby, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, most development, subject to certain exceptions, is regarded as inappropriate. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. The proposed raising of the roof height to form a first floor, erection of two storey and single storey extensions, and associated alterations, when considered in conjunction with previous additions, would result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. The proposal would therefore constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt. In addition, the design of the proposal would materially detract from its Green Belt setting. No very special circumstances that clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt are demonstrated. To permit the development would be contrary to Policies LP57(a) and (d) and LP24(c) of the Kirklees Local Plan, Key Design Principle 2 and Paragraphs 5.1, 5.2 and 5.24 of the Council's House Extensions and Alterations SPD, and Chapters 12 and 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework. (Decision in part to planning application 2023/62/90229/E)

Based on some of the planning that gets approval in the village and the negative impact it has on so many; it is difficult to know how to understand the criteria on which these decisions are made. I hope you will receive comments from enough people and consider not only this application but the ones that will quickly follow if this one is granted and 'dwelling', residential status is given to this particular building.

Respectfully...and hopefully!

142, Marsh Lane