

DC Admin

From: Louise Bearcroft
Sent: 25 November 2025 08:18
To: DC Admin
Subject: FW: Application 2025/92776 Eastfield, Shepley

Hello,

Please can you index this objection to 2025/92776.

Kind Regards

Louise Bearcroft
Senior Planning Officer

Planning and Development Service
Place Directorate
PO Box 1720, Huddersfield, HD1 9EL
Tel: 01484 221000 (Shortcode: 74126)
Website: www.kirklees.gov.uk

Please note my working days are Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday

From:
Sent: 20 November 2025 16:29
To: Louise Bearcroft <Louise.Bearcroft@kirklees.gov.uk>
Subject: Application 2025/92776 Eastfield, Shepley

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

Dear Louise

I strongly object to the proposed development by Banks to build 110 houses off Eastfield, Shepley which is Green Belt land. There is no question that this is Green Belt land and the National Planning Policy Framework Para 153 states that an application to develop Green Belt land should only be permitted in 'very special circumstances' which do not apply in this case given that it is not 'infill land' nor is there a 'demonstrable unmet need' for the type of development proposed. Banks are cherry picking between Local and Government policy regarding levels of affordable housing required to sustain their argument for this proposed development. There is considerable housing development already in Shepley, the majority being unfinished as it has come to a grinding halt. Why the need for further housing which would affect the quality of living in the village and attractiveness of the environment?

Given all the developments in the area, Shepley now sits on the outer edge of Huddersfield and is effectively an urban village. Should Banks propose that the land at Eastfield be considered for reclassification to grey belt, the area would not comply with the recent changes to government policy for this purpose. It will always remain Green Belt.

Proposed access to the site is, quite frankly, unsafe. The developer has conceded that ‘the visibility splays are insufficient when turning onto Knowle Park Avenue from the Knowle.’ Their proposal for a one-way system with vehicles exiting the proposed development using the Lea Drive junction with Abbey Road South when exiting the estate, takes no account of the 1 in 7 gradient down onto Abbey Road South which is treacherous in winter. This gradient exceeds current Highways regulations for planning developments. Cars have previously slipped down onto the main road during icy conditions. Should this be the only exit from the site, residents will be confined to their homes until road conditions improve, and emergency vehicles would be unable to exit the site should there be an obstruction at the junction due to accidents.

The volume of vehicles on Lea Drive, Eastfield and Knowle Park Avenue will severely impact these quiet residential streets where children frequently play, learn to cycle and complete cycle proficiency training made available by Shepley First School. This is a valuable safety initiative which would be jeopardised undermining Kirklees’ commitment to sustainable travel. Increased traffic will mean vehicles parking on pavements, blocking access to junctions, and conflicting with traffic at the Sovereign crossroads, a notorious blackspot, which will shortly see an increase in the large number of HGV’s given the recent planning consent for a quarry at Bromley Farm, Upper Cumberworth.

The proposed development will have a considerable impact on Shepley Spring a long-standing employer of over 100 staff. Any pollution of the water supply will provide a considerable threat to the business which in turn will impact on many families in the village. Their aquifer is within a protected zone SPZ1. If the aquifer cannot be protected from housing development what is the point of a protected zone?

Yorkshire Water has already advised the developer that the sewer network does not have sufficient available capacity to support the size of development proposed and that should the site come forward as part of a planning application they would likely not support the proposal. This indicates that further housing would overload the network leading to a discharge of sewage into local rivers and streams with devastating impact.

The developer does not believe the occupants of 110 new houses will use their cars (probably around 200) due to ‘excellent’ transport links in Shepley. In fact, buses are hourly finishing around 18.30 Monday to Saturday with no bus service at all on Sundays. Trains also run hourly, but a recent survey showed only 56.4% operated on time. The service is simply not reliable enough for anyone having to make a connection and access to Shepley Station is impossible for anyone with walking difficulties as one side can only be accessed by steps. All this means more cars will be used on the already busy A629 and surrounding roads.

Cars will also be needed for large weekly shopping at supermarkets which are some miles distant as Shepley does not have a Supermarket contrary to the developer’s assertion. More online delivery vehicles will also impact on the volume of traffic.

The proposed development will place further pressure on Shepley Health Centre. This will be unfair to existing patients, new patients and staff at the Health Centre and lead to a decline in service levels. Similarly, Shepley First School may currently have vacancies, but the demographic will increase by the time all proposed houses are occupied with children having to go to schools outside the village yet again.

I have lived in Shepley for 40 years and strongly believe that this proposal would completely change the village from being a desirable, safe place for all ages to live with extensive green spaces, to one choked with traffic and constant construction sites making life unpleasant and difficult for all.

Yours sincerely