

## DC Admin

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 30 March 2026 15:24  
**To:** DC Admin  
**Subject:** Objection - Eastfield 2025/60/9276/E

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

**Categories:**

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

### **Objection to Proposed Residential Development of 110 Dwellings (the Eastfield Development)**

**Ref: Eastfield 2025/60/92776/E**

#### **Please keep identifying details anonymous**

I wish to formally object to the proposed development of 110 new houses also known as the Eastfield Development. I have serious concerns regarding infrastructure capacity, highway safety, environmental impact, and the loss of green belt land. I believe that the development, as currently proposed, would cause significant harm to the local area and does not represent sustainable development.

#### **Impact on local infrastructure**

A major concern is the strain that an additional 110 dwellings would place on existing infrastructure, particularly the sewage system and local healthcare provision. There is insufficient evidence within the application to demonstrate that the current sewage network has the capacity to accommodate the increased demand generated by this development. Without confirmed upgrades or mitigation measures, there is a real risk of system overload, which could lead to pollution incidents and adverse impacts on the local environment.

The development would also increase demand on Shepley surgery, which already serves a growing population and experiences pressure on appointment availability. The application does not adequately address how this increased demand would be managed or mitigated. The absence of clear commitments or secured contributions towards healthcare infrastructure raises concerns that existing residents' access to services would be negatively affected.

#### **Highway safety and traffic concerns**

The proposed development would inevitably lead to a significant increase in traffic, adding numerous additional vehicles to the nearby trunk road. The proposed access point is of particular concern, as it appears poorly suited to accommodate the level of traffic associated with 110 new homes. Increased vehicle movements at this location would raise highway safety risks, particularly during peak commuting periods.

Further concerns relate to the impact on surrounding local roads, especially those in the vicinity of the zebra crossing. This crossing is an important pedestrian facility used by residents, including children and elderly people. Increased traffic volumes and turning movements close to the crossing would increase the risk to pedestrian safety and undermine the usability of the local road network. The application does not provide sufficient assurance that these risks can be satisfactorily addressed.

### **Loss of green belt and environmental impact**

The development would result in the loss of green belt land, which plays a vital role in maintaining the openness and rural character of the village. Green belt policy exists to prevent urban sprawl and protect the countryside from inappropriate development. The scale of this proposal would represent an encroachment into open land near the war memorial, causing lasting harm to the character and appearance of the area.

In addition, the site supports a range of local flora and fauna and contributes to biodiversity. Development on this scale would lead to habitat loss, disturbance, and fragmentation, with negative consequences for wildlife. The application does not sufficiently demonstrate that ecological impacts have been fully assessed or that effective mitigation and enhancement measures can be delivered. This is contrary to planning objectives that seek to protect and enhance the natural environment.

### **Sustainability and planning balance**

While the delivery of new housing is an important consideration, it should not outweigh significant harm to infrastructure capacity, highway safety, the environment, and the Green Belt. The cumulative impacts of the development have not been adequately addressed, and the proposal does not convincingly demonstrate that it meets the social, environmental, and infrastructure requirements of sustainable development.

### **Conclusion**

For the reasons outlined above, I strongly object to the proposed development. The scale of the scheme is inappropriate for the location, the infrastructure impacts are inadequately addressed, the highway safety concerns are significant, and the harm to the Green Belt and local biodiversity is unacceptable. I respectfully request that the Local Planning Authority refuses the application or requires substantial revisions and robust mitigation measures before it can be considered acceptable.