

I strongly **OBJECT** to this application. It does not provide any significant public benefit and is not located in a sustainable location with strong infrastructure and transport connections. The application conflicts with:

1. NPPF & Local Plan
2. Kirklees Council's:
 - Health and Wellbeing Strategy
 - Inclusive Economic Strategy
 - Environment Strategy
 - Vision and shared outcomes.

As stated in the NPPF (Section 11, d, ii) permission should not be granted where *'any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits'*. The adverse impact this development would have on those residing and visiting Shepley would be catastrophic and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. Section 83 of the NPPF states that housing should be located where it will enhance rural communities and support local services. This development will not do this. I list my specific concerns below:

- **Detrimental impact on (mental) health and wellbeing:**
 - NPPF Chapter 8 relates to 'Promoting healthy and safe communities'. Section 96c states that planning decisions should *'enable and support healthy lives, through both promoting good health and preventing ill-health'*. As stated in Kirklees Health and Wellbeing policy *'where we live significantly affects our health and wellbeing'* and Section 103 of the NPPF refers to the importance of open spaces for health and wellbeing. Section 17.5 of the Local Plan states that health and wellbeing is not compromised as a result of new development.

I have serious concerns that the approval of this application will adversely impact upon the (mental) health and wellbeing of those residing and visiting Shepley and thus, is in conflict with the aforementioned policies/plans. I also query whether a HIA should have been submitted under section 17.11 of the Local Plan? There is a strong evidence base demonstrating the impact of open/green spaces on promoting health and wellbeing. Removing green belt land (clearly enjoyed and valued as an important asset by residents and visitors) will negatively impact upon people's mental health, physical health and wellbeing, thus impacting upon quality of life. This contradicts the Council's Health and Wellbeing policy and the priority of 'Mental Wellbeing – for everyone in Kirklees to achieve good mental wellbeing' and the shared outcome of 'Well' – people in Kirklees are as well as possible for as long as possible.

The issue of traffic volume and inconsiderate car parking already causes angst/stress amongst residents and visitors. This development will only add to this – again impacting upon people's health and wellbeing.

The air pollution generated (during both its development and use) will negatively affect physical health – especially those of children, young people and the elderly – contradicting the Council's Health and Wellbeing policy and the outcome of 'Well'.

- It seems ironic that Kirklees is increasingly being seen to push its health and wellbeing agenda (e.g. through the National Health Innovation Campus and the Huddersfield Health Innovation Incubator programme), yet potentially affecting the health and wellbeing of its own residents should such applications in the greenbelt be approved. In response to the HHII programme, Councillor Turner stated it is an 'innovative solution' to 'improving health outcomes'. One innovative idea to help Kirklees improve its health outcomes is to protect its greenbelt!
- **Concerns regarding erosion of the green belt and air pollution and impact on Kirklees Climate Change Emergency**
 - Section 103 of the NPPF refers to the importance of open spaces for health and wellbeing, the wider benefits for nature and helping to address climate change. This development would adversely affect these important issues. Valuable green space enjoyed by both residents and visitors will be eroded and have a significant impact on wildlife and the environment (conflicting the Council's Environment Strategy and shared outcome of 'Clean and green'). I was mortified to read in the applicant's planning statement that they would plan to remove trees which are '*of limited importance*' (p.43). No tree is of limited importance! As stated in section 136 of the NPPF '*trees make an important contribution...and existing trees are retained wherever possible*'. It is evident (through the 200+ objections submitted to date) that the green belt is extremely important to the residents of Shepley. I reiterate the value this community places on green space and nature and its proven link to health and wellbeing benefits.
 - As stated in the Local Plan (18.3) '*Poor air quality is a significant public health issue*'. A further increase of vehicular traffic through the village of Shepley will negatively impact upon air quality (thus impacting on physical health) and conflicts with the Council's aim of addressing the climate emergency where it states carbon emissions need to be dramatically reduced. It also contradicts the shared outcome of 'Well' and 'Clean and Green – people in Kirklees experience a high quality, clean, sustainable and green environment'. The applicant themselves state that there will be high levels of dust (p. 42) and this conflicts with Policy LP51 of the Local Plan. 'High levels of dust' in very close proximity to the First School is not acceptable. I would be extremely concerned for the health of the lungs of our children walking to School and playing outside in such polluted air and the long-term impact of this.
- **Concerns regarding impact on infrastructure and transport connections**
 - As per policy LP49 of the Local Plan, this development will not support local services, it will drain them even further. The GP Surgery, dentist and schools are already oversubscribed. Even though the applicant refers to Section 106, in reality it will not deal/resolve or support the existing strain on local services.
 - It is already very difficult to make an appointment to see a GP. It is in my opinion that people's health and wellbeing will greatly suffer with this extra and excessive demand – the Shepley community will not be able to access support when they need it. This contradicts the Council's Health and

Wellbeing policy and shared outcome of 'Well' – people in Kirklees are as well as possible for as long as possible.

- Section 100 of the NPPF refers to the importance of ensuring that a sufficient choice of education provision is '*available to meet the needs of existing and new communities*'. The local First School is already oversubscribed with parents anxious about securing school placements. I am not convinced that any Section 106 funding will be allocated to deal with this in a sustainable manner and question how this chimes with the Council's 'Best Start – children have the best start in life' outcome.
- Chapter 9 of the NPPF refers to promoting sustainable transport. This development will not do this. Whilst the village does have a train station and bus routes, they are not serviced regularly and as such I do not agree that the village offers '*a genuine choice of transport modes*' (NPPF, 110). As such there will be an over reliance on using vehicles which will increase congestion and emissions, reduce air quality and impact on public health. This will conflict with the outcomes of 'Well' and 'Clean and Green'.

- **Concerns regarding road safety**

Section 116 of the NPPF states that developments should be refused if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety – this development will make an unacceptable impact on highway safety. I already have serious concerns about the volume of vehicular traffic within the village and road safety:

- As Safer Kirklees will already be aware, there have been fatalities, near fatalities and multiple road traffic collisions in Shepley - indeed, the village recently featured on the local news highlighting the issues. The volume of traffic will significantly increase as will the number of incidents - therefore increasing calls for service to our (already overstretched) emergency services and impacting upon our NHS Trusts. One of Kirklees shared outcomes is 'Shaped by people' - please listen to the residents of Shepley re: parking and traffic issues. We see the issues and the 'near misses' on a daily basis that will not appear in any statistics/analysis.
- The proposed traffic flow around the development is completely unsafe for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles and conflicts with section 117c of the NPPF. The proposed highway changes would be dangerous, especially in the winter months when the roads can be treacherous due to the ice and snow. Again, I have serious concerns that this will impact on public health and increase calls for service to the emergency services. With location of the proposed development in close proximity to a First School, I have serious concerns about the safety of children and parents/carers walking to and from School.
- Section 135f of the NPPF states that decisions should '*create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and wellbeing...and where crime and disorder...do not undermine the quality of life*'. This development will not do this. Anti-social behaviour is defined as causing alarm, harassment or distress and can significantly impact upon people's mental health and wellbeing. As is evident from the objections submitted to date, the proposed highway changes and associated vehicle nuisance would cause severe distress to residents and visitors and impact upon fears of safety. The proposed development and highway changes would not work in practice and there would be an increase in anti-social parking creating issues among residents/visitors and those needing to access (such as service and

emergency service vehicles). I urge the Council to remember their duty under Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and the shared objective of 'safe and cohesive – people in Kirklees live in cohesive communities, feel safe and are protected from harm'.

- **Concerns regarding the future of Shepley Spring and local employment**
 - NPPF Section 85 states that significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth. The application must be refused as the development would have a detrimental impact on Shepley Spring – this would not be supporting economic growth and would impact on job security. Shepley Spring is one of Kirklees' top-performing businesses and named in the recent Kirklees Top 100 businesses. It is a large employer to Kirklees residents and a valuable supporter of the local community. The detrimental impact the development would have on Shepley Spring conflicts with the Inclusive Economic Strategy and the shared objective of 'sustainable economy'.

Section 135a of the NPPF states that decisions should ensure that developments *'will function well not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development'*. This development will not do this. It will not be sustainable. In my opinion, the application is clearly focused on short term 'gains' and continuing references that the Council's local plan is 'outdated' was tiresome and, at times, desperate – further demonstrating the applicants focus on short term (financial) gains. I appreciate the Council is working on producing an updated Local Plan and they should not be shoehorned into considering applications that are quite simply a 'quick win' or a 'sticking plaster' in the short term, without considering the impact this will have in the long term.

Whilst I appreciate the Council's/Government's need to increase levels of housing provision, this cannot, nor should not, be solely absorbed by the village of Shepley and at the detriment to the community's (mental) health and wellbeing. The adverse impacts of this development demonstrably outweigh the benefits and conflicts with several of the Council's own strategic policies and shared outcomes. It does not provide any significant public benefit and must be **REFUSED**.