

DC Admin

From:
Sent: 21 March 2026 10:14
To: DC Admin
Subject: Eastfield 2025/60/92776/E

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Re: Planning Application Ref: 2025/60/92776/E – Eastfield, Shepley

I wish to formally object to the above planning application on the following grounds:

Firstly, the proposed site lies within a designated protection zone for Shepley Spring, a vital water source safeguarded by the Environment Agency. Paragraphs 174 and 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) require planning decisions to protect and enhance the natural environment and prevent pollution. In addition, Kirklees Local Plan Policy LP26 (Water Resources, Quality and Treatment) seeks to ensure that development does not pose an unacceptable risk to water quality. The scale and duration of construction, along with the long-term use of the site, present a significant risk of contamination, contrary to both national and local policy.

Secondly, the development would result in a substantial increase in traffic, with approximately 250 additional vehicles expected. This conflicts with NPPF Paragraph 115, which requires that development should not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety. Kirklees Local Plan Policy LP21 (Highways Safety and Design) further requires that development provides safe and suitable access for all users. The proposed one-way access via Lea Drive, with its steep gradient, poor visibility, and hazardous conditions in winter, combined with increased traffic through Eastfield, presents a clear and unacceptable risk to both motorists and pedestrians, particularly children.

Thirdly, local infrastructure is already under considerable strain. NPPF Paragraphs 8 and 34 emphasise the need for sustainable communities supported by adequate infrastructure. Kirklees Local Plan Policies LP22 (Parking) and LP24 (Developer Contributions) require that development is supported by appropriate infrastructure provision. The proposal fails to demonstrate how increased demand on schools, healthcare services, and parking will be mitigated, rendering the development unsustainable.

The development also constitutes inappropriate development within the Green Belt. Under NPPF Paragraphs 137–151, such development is, by definition, harmful unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated. Kirklees Local Plan Policy LP11 (Green Belt) reinforces the need to preserve openness and prevent urban sprawl. No very special circumstances have been provided, and the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and openness of the area.

In addition, there are serious concerns regarding drainage and sewer capacity. NPPF Paragraph 181 requires that development should not increase flood risk and must incorporate sustainable drainage systems. Kirklees Local Plan Policy LP25 (Flood Risk) similarly requires that development avoids exacerbating flood risk and ensures adequate drainage infrastructure. Evidence of frequent sewer

overflows indicates that the current system is already under pressure, and the application fails to demonstrate a satisfactory solution.

Furthermore, the proposal appears premature, having been submitted ahead of the adoption of the finalised Local Plan. NPPF Paragraph 49 allows for refusal on prematurity grounds where development would undermine the plan-making process. Given the scale and sensitivity of this Green Belt site, this application risks prejudicing the emerging spatial strategy.

Finally, the proposal conflicts with the core objective of sustainable development as set out in NPPF Paragraph 8. The environmental harm, infrastructure deficiencies, and highway safety concerns clearly outweigh any potential benefits. As such, the proposal does not represent sustainable development when assessed against both national and local planning policy.

For the reasons outlined above, I respectfully request that this application be refused.