

Dear Louise,

We'd firstly like to raise significant and formal concerns regarding the consultation period for the above application. We notice the time for comments has now passed, even though it has only been up on line for a very short period. It was posted on line well after the date originally stated on the application. This could be seen as a blatant attempt to push this through "under the carpet".

Secondly we'd like to raise the following concerns regarding the application:-

1. Greenbelt. Whilst the government is trying to change the rules regarding planning regs, they haven't yet and so clearly the old rules prevail. The attempt by the developer to rename this grey belt is unsound. Clearly this application is on greenbelt as the land was given a DEFRA grant in 2003 for the growth of Roof Thatching. This has continued to this day in one way or another and again this Autumn has been planted again with crops, (I'm unclear on the specific type). Clearly this proposal is against current government guidance.
2. The proposed site sits on a SPZ1 area due to the location of Shepley Spring and the aquifers that they use for their bottled water. Clearly any contamination would yield the water useless and have a significant and detrimental impact on their business, even if the development was to the south of the SPZ1. Clearly Shepley Spring will not support this proposal.
3. Access and ingress onto the site. Both during construction AND after the additional traffic within the site and up to and including Abbey road would be dangerous. The proposal has a one way system, (because the roads are so narrow AND have parked cars on them), with the exit down the very steep road Lea Drive. In winter this could be catastrophic when ice is there allowing cars and trucks to slide down onto the main road.
4. Unsafe. Currently the whole estate has cars parked on the roads, children playing, bicycle proficiency tests, dog walkers etc using it and is single track. Another additional 200 cars would clearly make the whole area unsafe. Residents would feel much less safe if the proposal goes ahead.
5. Data not reliable. The data used for the movement of cars, the soil samples and other matters provided within the application are out of date and or unvalidated. Data needs revalidating with correct and up to date data and actual field work, rather than desk research.
6. Dangerous junctions. The junctions at the Black Bull pub, (where there is a pedestrian crossing), and at Cross lane near the Sovereign are clearly already dangerous. There have been numerous accidents at Cross lane and only last week a pedestrian was hit on the crossing at the Black Bull junction. Clearly additional traffic would exacerbate this.
7. The Woods to the south of the location is also where the War Memorial is located and is a Heritage site. This is where people go to remember and reflect. Additional noise from the proposed site, during and after construction, would destroy the peace and tranquility of this location. It must also be noted that the developer is proposing to "manage" the woods, which would invariably mean cutting ancient woodland down, especially to the South. This is inevitable due to the Trees being to the South of the development and taking the sun off the new houses.
8. Additional strain of overloaded sewage. Whilst there is a statutory requirement for YW to connect the development, I have been reviewing the YW live map which monitors outflows into rivers etc. Clearly there are breaches. I have done a Freedom of Information request to YW no 1165 to get more information on this matter and will send this on in due course. Within the application at the flood Risk Assessment section which is Appendix 12 to the Planning Statement. At page 61 there is this statement also:-

*"At present the sewer network does not have sufficient available capacity to support the size of development proposed. It is understood that the site is not allocated within the adopted Kirklees Local Plan and as such the site has not been considered within the current Yorkshire Water Asset Management Plan (AMP) period. Should the site come forward as part of a planning application Yorkshire Water (YWS) would likely not support the proposal."*

9. Local Services. Shepley First School only has only one spare place, the local “supermarket” as presented in the application is actually convenience store not a supermarket, the surgery is already at capacity, the parking in the village is a nightmare, congestion on Marsh Lane / Station road in the Village is terrible etc etc. Clearly an additional 259 people, and 200 cars for this development, (at average households for Yorkshire), would put additional strain on resources which are already stretched due to the development at Abbey Road by Vivly Living.

10. Finally and importantly, this proposal does NOT form part of the Kirklees Local Plan.

Should the farmer and the developer wish to develop the farm buildings only into some sort of housing we would be very supportive, otherwise we both strongly object to the proposal as it stands.

Kind regards