

DC Admin

From: Louise Bearcroft
Sent: 25 November 2025 08:19
To: DC Admin
Subject: FW: Application 2025/92776 Eastfield, Shepley

Hello,

Please can you add this representation 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 17:13
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 would like to register my objection to the proposed development off Eastfield in Shepley.

There is already significant housing development underway in Shepley, much of which remains unfinished and has stalled. This raises the question of why further housing is necessary, especially when it risks diminishing the village's quality of life and its natural, attractive environment.

The land off Eastfield is designated as Green Belt, and the importance of its protection cannot be overstated. It is indisputable that the site in question is Green Belt land. According to the National Planning Policy Framework, Paragraph 153, development on Green Belt land should only be permitted in 'very special circumstances'. These circumstances clearly do not apply in this case, as the land is neither considered 'infill land' nor is there a 'demonstrable unmet need' for the type of development proposed. Furthermore, Banks appear to be selectively interpreting both local and government policies, particularly regarding affordable housing requirements, to bolster their argument in support of this development.

Shepley, once a rural village, now sits at the periphery of Huddersfield and has essentially become an urban village. Should Banks pursue reclassification of the Eastfield land to 'grey belt', it would not meet the criteria

set out in recent government policy changes. The area should therefore remain Green Belt, preserving its status and protection.

The proposed access arrangements for the site are impractical. The developer has admitted that the visibility splays at the Knowle Park Avenue and Knowle junction are insufficient. Their alternative proposal—a one-way system directing traffic to exit via the Lea Drive junction onto Abbey Road South—fails to consider the steep 1 in 7 gradient, which becomes hazardous in winter conditions and exceeds current Highways regulations for new developments. There have been previous incidents of cars sliding onto the main road during icy weather. Relying on this as the sole exit would trap residents during adverse conditions and could prevent emergency vehicles from exiting if there is an obstruction at the junction.

A significant increase in traffic on Lea Drive, Eastfield, and Knowle Park Avenue will disrupt these quiet residential roads, where children frequently play, learn to cycle, and participate in cycle proficiency training organised by Shepley First School. This valuable safety initiative would be at risk, undermining Kirklees' commitment to sustainable travel. Increased traffic could also result in more vehicles parking on pavements, blocked junctions, and additional congestion at the Sovereign crossroads—a known accident blackspot—soon to experience more heavy goods vehicle traffic due to a recently approved quarry at Bromley Farm, Upper Cumberworth.

Yorkshire Water has already informed the developer that the local sewer network lacks the capacity to support such a large development. Should a planning application proceed, it is likely that Yorkshire Water would oppose it. Overloading the network could lead to sewage discharges into local rivers and streams, causing severe environmental damage.

The developer's claim that residents of the new houses will not heavily rely on cars due to 'excellent' transport links is unfounded. Bus services in Shepley are limited, running only hourly and finishing early evening from Monday to Saturday, with no service on Sundays. Trains also run hourly, but a recent survey showed that only 56.4% operated on time, making them unreliable for connections. Additionally, access to Shepley Station is challenging for those with mobility issues, as one platform is only accessible by steps. Consequently, car use will increase, adding to congestion on the already busy A629 and surrounding roads. Residents will also need cars for weekly supermarket shopping, as there are no supermarkets in Shepley, contrary to the developer's assertion. The resulting increase in online deliveries will further add to local traffic volumes.

The proposed development could have serious consequences for Shepley Spring, a longstanding local employer with over 100 staff. Any contamination of the water supply would threaten the business and the livelihoods of many families. Significantly, the aquifer serving Shepley Spring lies within a protected zone (SPZ1). If this protected zone cannot be safeguarded from housing development, its designation becomes meaningless.

An increase in houses will place additional strain on Shepley Health Centre, unfairly impacting both existing and future patients as well as staff, likely diminishing service quality. Although Shepley First School may currently have vacancies, the local population is expected to rise by the time all new homes are occupied, potentially forcing children to attend schools outside the village.

Shepley is a desirable village in which to live which will be greatly impacted by further development. It's important to protect the village and retain our green fields for future generations.

Yours sincerely