

Address: 4, Stocks Drive, Huddersfield, Hd8 8ey

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?	No
<p>Further to my previous comments on this application, I wish to add the following points.</p> <p>I moved back to Shepley in 2023 after growing up here. I was registered with Shepley Dental Practice from 1994 until 2017 and assumed I would be able to rejoin when I returned to the village, but despite repeated attempts I have been unable to get back onto their list. I currently have to travel elsewhere and pay privately. This is relevant because it demonstrates that essential local services are already operating beyond their practical capacity. It is not a future risk; it is already happening.</p> <p>The same issue is now emerging with education. Shepley First School is projected to be at capacity by 2028 without this development, and there are already cases of children living in the village being placed at Thurstonland due to lack of space. This shows that the system is not coping during peak years, and since the school is a listed building and cannot expand, any additional demand created by this proposal would have to be dispersed out of the village. That directly undermines the sustainability claims made in the application.</p> <p>There is also a persistent attempt within the planning documents to refer to the Co-op as a supermarket. This is factually incorrect. It is a small convenience store with limited range, and the parking around it already creates hazardous conditions on Station Road and Marsh Lane due to short-stay stopping. Using this to justify sustainability assessments is misleading and does not reflect the reality of how residents obtain weekly food shopping, which relies almost entirely on car travel.</p> <p>Highway conditions across the village are already failing. Abbey Road regularly requires drivers to veer into the centre of the road due to the level of street parking. Firth Street residents frequently raise visibility concerns when pulling onto the main road. Station Road and parts of Marsh Lane are permanently a one-way flow because of residents parking and vehicles stopping outside the Co-op. The assumption that most new residents will work from home, based on national 2021 census data gathered during the height of pandemic remote working, is not credible for a rural</p>	

gathered during the height of pandemic remote working, is not credible for a rural village where the majority of employment is in trades, care, education and other roles that require physical attendance. The projected traffic impact has therefore been significantly underestimated.

The proposed access arrangements raise serious issues. Kirklees' own design standards set out clear requirements for safe gradients, bin drag distances and RCV manoeuvring. The access slopes on Lea Drive and Knowle Lane are around 1 in 7, which does not meet these standards in any form. Existing houses on Lea Drive do not set a precedent for approving new development with unsafe access. The Council's current guidance establishes what constitutes safe and acceptable access today, and this proposal does not meet those requirements. The fact that the applicant has now suggested a one-way system implicitly acknowledges that the Knowle Lane junction is unsafe. Directing all traffic onto a route that still fails gradient standards does not resolve the issue; it highlights it.

Concerns from Shepley Spring regarding Source Protection Zone 1 are also significant. Their review shows that the outline plan demonstrates no understanding of the risks associated with drainage discharging above active potable water abstraction boreholes. The entire site slopes down towards SPZ1, so any surface water runoff, including pollutants from roads and residential areas, would travel directly toward the protected zone. This is not comparable to existing houses already within SPZ1, as those do not sit uphill of the zone with drainage directed into it. The applicant's outline strategy does not satisfy the level of protection required for development above a drinking water source.

The Coal Authority's response reinforces that the application is incomplete and premature. They have requested several reports, investigations and design amendments before any development can be considered. Until these are submitted and assessed, the proposal cannot be considered sound.

Taken together, these points demonstrate that the current outline application does not meet essential safety, infrastructure, or environmental requirements. The access is not compliant with the Council's standards, the drainage strategy poses unresolved risks to a protected water source, and local services cannot absorb the level of growth proposed. On this basis, the application should not proceed.