

Wed 03/12

Planning application 2025/60/92776/E

I have studied all the supporting documentation that has been submitted to support this application and I wish to bring the following points to the attention of the planning authority.

- 1) This site is green belt land that is currently in agricultural use. Government policy permits development in very special circumstances. There is nothing in the submission to justify special circumstances. There is no demonstrable need here, the site is actively contributing to the principles set out in the NPPF framework as to why Green Belt is needed. It doesn't even meet the criteria for grey belt. The walk down from the war memorial along the edge of the proposed site is a very pleasant experience, this will be lost forever. Bats can often be seen at dusk along there. The recent developments along the north end of Abbey Road have effectively joined Shepley to Shelley. In fact, there is so little green land along the A629 that Shepley, Shelley feel more like one and an outcrop of Huddersfield.

- 2) The submission paints a utopian picture of life in the new development and totally ignores what happened after the boundary. All traffic has to come via Eastfield. The roads on the existing estate are narrow and in poor condition. The growth of on-line shopping has significantly increased the number of delivery vehicles on the estate. Cars visiting frequently park on the kerb to avoid blocking the road.

The proposed one-way system is dangerous and will lead to more accidents. A one-way system would force traffic to leave via Lea drive on to Abbey Road. During the Winter months when ice and snow occur due to the slope, this is a dangerous route. I have seen occasions where vehicles have slid out into the traffic on Abbey Road. There is also a drop of about 5 to 6 meters on the opposite side of Abbey Road. This is a route avoided by residents during the winter if at all possible. Add in all the parked cars and increased traffic during school start and finish times and it will only be a matter of time before a serious accident or fatality occurs if this system is implemented. The entrance along The Knowle also has problems, it's a blind turn in and traffic frequently backs up. During the Winter cars are parked on the corner and along Knowle Park Avenue so that residents can get out during periods of ice and snow.

There is no supermarket in the village it is a small Co-Op used more as a convenience store. Most people travel to a supermarket for their weekly shop or have it delivered; I don't see any reason why the new development will be any different.

The bus service does not run on a Sunday and is mostly hourly on the other days finishing around six pm. The train service is unreliable mainly due to the fact that it is single line in places which results in delays, the bottom end of Station Road is always choc a bloc with parked cars during the day.

There are no safe routes to cycle anywhere, Abbey Road is busy and traffic doesn't seem to observe the speed limits especially when heading towards Huddersfield. It is obvious that a vehicle will be the main means of transport for the development.

During the build phase there will be a substantial increase in heavy plant, machinery, heavy traffic and noise on the estate, this will have a health and safety knock on for residents.

There is no mention how this will be managed in the submission.

- 3) The site sits on and adjacent to the Spring protection zone for Shepley Spring. Shepley Spring is a local business that employs local people and has actively contributed to the village for years. There is likely to be a threat to the quality of the water as a result of the development

and serious damage to Shepley Springs business. The Geological report supporting the application was little more than a desk top exercise. This point alone should be enough to reject the application.

- 4) Yorkshire water has said that sewage capacity is only just sufficient to support current needs. The site is not allocated within the current adopted Kirklees plan and has not been considered by Yorkshire Water in its current management plan. YWS have said they are unlikely to support the application. We already have low water pressure and problems with sewage.
- 5) Local amenities are already stretched. It is difficult enough getting appointments at the Heath Centre and Dentists, this will only make matters worse.
- 6) There is no mention in the submission regarding the impact on Yorkshire Electricity ability to supply power. The Electricity supply often suffers short interruptions and the incoming voltage is often at the low end of specification during peak periods. Broadband is average at present again no mention of the ability to meet the extra demand.
- 7) Shepley First School is already near capacity. The submission mentions 18 extra places as a result of this development. It's an old building with no easy means of increasing its capacity. Add the contribution from the ongoing Vivily Living development and there is unlikely to be any spare capacity. This will result in more vehicles getting the pupils to school.
- 8) The submission is disingenuous, it selectively cherry picks support for its application and ignore ones that do not. Examples of this are it says the KLP is out of date when it isn't – a new one is being developed but then uses the KLP figure for affordable housing of 35% and not the default figure of 50% from the NPPF if no local plan exists. The village has a supermarket is another instance. It says it will create green open spaces and children's play areas- the site is a green open space already enjoyed by many walking along its boundaries. There are two very good plays areas in the village at present.
- 9) The proposed development state 35% will be affordable homes but there are no details of what these will actual be. Affordable homes are ones that meet the needs of the local people. The Vivily development affordable homes are small one bedroomed houses only really suitable for one person.
- 10) The Vivily development is currently progressing very slowly and the impact of this has yet to be fully felt on the village. It appears at times as if it has stalled and work practically stops. It still appears to be way off completion. Why is another development being considered when this one is obviously struggling?

I am strongly opposed to this application for the above reasons. I can see nothing positive for the Village only negative ones for exiting residents of the village. I urge that it is rejected by the planning committee.