

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?	Yes

To whom it may concern,

I wish to register my objection regarding Banks Group's planning application for land at Eastfield, Shepley.

This land is green belt, not grey belt, which is the new category of lower quality land e.g. old car parking.

The boundaries of green belts are in place. In particular, an important aim of the boundaries is to prevent urban sprawl, "preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another". This aim now specifically only relates to towns/cities, not villages.

Allowing development on green belt will lead eventually to our villages merging and then subsequently into our town. Definitely not achieving the aim to encircle "settlements to keep their separation."

Paragraph 145 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that the established green belt boundaries should only be altered under exceptional circumstances e.g. strategic policies. Is there such an exception? If there were, the authority should have shown how it has looked into all other options.

Paragraph 154 of the framework says that developing the green belt would be inappropriate unless one of the exceptions apply. None of which 154a) – 154h) vi appear to do so. In paragraph 155, again none of the exceptions apply. I cannot believe this is "b...a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed". If land is released from the green belt there are Golden Rules which must be adhered to. One of these is "necessary improvements to local or national infrastructure". Is there a significant intention to do so by Banks?

The Kirklees Local Plan 2019 (five-year plan) does still stand. Banks Group considers it to be no longer valid. However, on the other hand, Banks would like to opt in to the plan's affordable housing percentage as it would end up being less than the government's preferred 50%.

Furthermore, the proposed access along Lea Drive and Knowle Park Avenue is completely unsuitable for the protracted building phase and for the completed development. It is narrow with residential and business traffic (BGM Plastics and Shepley Spring). There is poor visibility at The Knowle/Knowle Park Avenue. Banks agrees and proposes a one-way system with all traffic emerging steeply onto Abbey Road, across which there is a precipitous drop. The congestion would be further aggravated by the parent dropping off and collecting times for Shepley First School. Shepley has a railway station. The service is hourly and often unreliable. Presumably because we have a station, our bus services are inadequate and do not cover evenings. The village has new housing and one convenience store. Our doctors' surgery supports other villages and is stretched at the best of times.

Yorkshire Water has said it does not have enough capacity for the proposed development of 110 houses. This aspect also reflects greatly on one of our businesses. Shepley Spring cannot afford to have disturbance to their water supply. It would be catastrophic. Shepley Spring has benefitted our village in a number of ways. They would certainly not risk investing further and may decide to leave our village.