

About the application

Application number: 2025/92776	
What is the application for?:	Outline application, with all matters reserved, for residential development with
Address of the site or building:	land at, Eastfield, Shepley, Huddersfield, HD8 8HB
Postcode:	DH7 8XL

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<p>I strongly oppose the proposed development on land immediately adjacent to Shepley Spring, where bottled water is extracted and supplied nationally. This field lies within a Source Protection Zone 1—the highest-risk groundwater designation under Environment Agency guidance. Building a large housing estate in such close proximity is wholly unsuitable and poses an evident contamination risk from surface run-off, vehicle fluids, and household drainage. Nowhere else within the wider zone are buildings situated so near to the extraction point. This location is simply too sensitive for residential development, given the potential consequences for public health on a national scale. It poses a significant risk to the future viability of an extremely successful and valuable employer in the local area.</p> <p>The land has historically been used for growing roof-thatching straw, not chemical-intensive crops. This should be explicitly acknowledged to prevent any implication of past contamination being used to justify redevelopment. It remains green, productive farmland.</p> <p>The transport evidence provided by the developer is also misleading. Their assumptions are based largely on national 2021 census data collected during lockdowns, which do not reflect real travel patterns in a rural village. In Shepley, very few residents work from home; many are tradespeople, carers, or staff at local schools and nurseries who travel daily. Even outside peak hours, roads such as Station Road, Jos Lane, parts of Abbey Road, and Marsh Lane often function as single-file routes due to parked cars, and visibility at several junctions—particularly around Abbey Road—is already poor. Adding hundreds of additional vehicle movements would significantly worsen an already hazardous situation. Near-misses continue at the Sovereign junction, and despite repeated concerns from residents, no effective speed or parking enforcement has been introduced. Without firm, detailed mitigation from highways officers, safety will deteriorate further.</p> <p>The transport assessments also overlook the demographic realities of Eastfield: many current residents are retired, housing is low density, many bungalows, which attract retired and older people in a safe and quiet environment, but new housing will bring</p>	

retired and older people in a safe and quiet environment, but new housing will bring working families whose car use will be considerably higher. The suggestion that future occupants will routinely walk or cycle to work or rely on online grocery shopping is unrealistic. Even Shepley First School struggles with traffic on the one-way Firth Street, with parents driving children to and from school en route to work—contrary to the assumptions in the supporting documents. The surrounding roads around the school including Stonecroft Gardens, Eastfield, Lea Drive, Firth Street and Lea Head are packed with cars dropping children off at Shepley First School. These houses will also feed extra pupils to Middle Schools and Shelley College, which again will add to traffic on local roads.

The large scale nature of this development will lead to the long term construction of a site accessed via a quiet and inadequate road leading to disturbance by construction traffic for years for those local residents living on local roads of Eastfield, The Knowle, Lea Drive.

The proposed access to the site from Eastfield and apparent suggestion of a one way system is ridiculous. Having lived on the estate for years, when the weather is bad in winter, which in Shepley it snows more heavily than other surrounding areas, the proposed exit route via the sloping road from Stonecroft Gardens to Abbey Road is treacherous. Local residents avoid this road at all costs in icy and snowy weather as it is highly unsafe to enter Abbey Road this way. Local residents know to use the entrance/exit via the Knowle. Cutting this route off to exiting traffic would exacerbate the already very unsafe conditions during winter.

The proposed site borders historic woodland shown on early Ordnance Survey maps and sits directly beside the Grade II listed Shepley War Memorial. The plans refer to woodland “management” that appears more akin to clearance, raising legitimate concerns about future expansion behind the memorial and along the wider boundary. Any loss of trees or encroachment into this landscape would severely harm both the visual character and heritage value of the area. The memorial is a place of quiet reflection, yet the housing designs are generic and suburban, bearing no resemblance to Shepley’s traditional character.

Shepley has already accommodated substantial growth, including developments towards Shelley and around 80 new homes approved for Vivly Living on a brownfield site—an area far more appropriate and accessible, without the heavy on-street parking that constrains the main road elsewhere. While opinions on that scheme vary locally, at least the buildings are not visually intrusive. By contrast, building on this highly sensitive site would place unnecessary pressure on local infrastructure and cause irreversible harm to our war memorial, woodland, and surrounding countryside. It is deeply concerning that the council would even consider development on a sloping field within SPZ1, directly beside a nationally significant bottled-water facility.

The site is designated Green Belt Land in the local plan and has not been considered through the ratification of the plan in the usual way. Local people have not had the opportunity to consider the use of this land for housing in the usual democratic process of the local plan. There are no special circumstances which warrant this development and it were to be approved it would open up all fields surrounding local villages to the same fate. The location and scale of this development is hugely out of character for the size and nature of the village.

For all these reasons, this proposal is entirely unsuitable for the location and should be refused.