

**Application number 2025/93572**

**Outline planning application for land south of Barnsley Road HD8 8NN**

**Date 15<sup>th</sup> February 2025**

Dear Sir/Madam

This is an objection in respect of the above application. I wish for my comments to appear online anonymously.

I consider this application to be deeply flawed, both in terms of quality of the application, for example the drawings are not to scale, and in terms of the accuracy of the reports submitted. My objections cover a range of issues, so for ease I will separate out my comments and objection by heading.

- 1. Location :**The field in question is greenbelt land, it is farmed growing winter crops ,it is also grazed, currently by sheep eating winter turnips planted by the tenant farmer. It sits in the middle of a myriad of public footpaths which are used regularly by locals and by people from further afield, these footpaths lead directly into Stephen Wood, part of the Ancient woodland network that forms part of the Upper Dearne. The location of this proposed development, next to this area risks both damage to the ancient woodland and associated flora and fauna but also will impact on the industrial and heritage assets of the area. The footpaths are rooted in history forming the network of paths used by textile workers heading to and from work. They should be preserved as a heritage asset for the Borough.
- 2. Long range vista:** This is a large residential proposal with wide ranging effects upon the landscape character and visual amenity. The form of this proposal as outlined in the plan's conflicts with the scenic quality of the existing landscape. It will impact on the vista from Birdsedge to upper Cumberworth, particularly from the top part of old Park Lane , adjacent to the football field.
- 3. Ancient woodland:** The impact of an adjacent development, will be catastrophic to these woods and will cause irreparable damage. The impact of a lengthy period of development will result in ecological decline and the loss of valuable species of flora and fauna . Noise disturbance, light pollution and chemical wash off from the site would impact both on the habitat of birds and mammals and in some instances lead to their loss. Alongside this the increased flow of people along the paths would lead to a reduction in vegetation cover and likely and the risk of deviation from the standard paths, will result in areas of no growth. The more fragmented the wood becomes then the more edges are created and this in turn impacts on hydration and predation.
- 4. Habitat :** The woodland is a haven for wildlife, with Tawny owl, flycatcher, tree creeper and goldcrest present (Britain's smallest songbird) . There are large colonies of Hairy Northern wood Ant living on the forest floor. There are many wild flowers, pink purslane , wild garlic, yellow saxifrage and red campion. There are many animals in the woods, deer, badger , bats and squirrel amongst them . The disturbance of a development risks many of thee species being lost. The Hairy Northern wood Ant is referenced in Kirklees Species Action Plan, its is a red listed species and this site the only location in Kirklees.

5. **Drainage** : The plans produced by the developer in this regard are inaccurate. This field is regularly visited by Yorkshire water, they have confirmed in writing that there is no capacity in the existing system for the safe discharge of foul waste . The proposal to direct such waste to a pump station is not sustainable and would no doubt lead to pollution incidents when the pumps fail due to power outage for example. Just in this last two weeks Yorkshire water attended following a storm when the manhole in the field was surging and discharging into the woods .The proposed surface water outfall into the woods would require the adjacent landowner to give permission and in any event would cause damage to the root protection area within the woods. This is an area of real concern. Surface water and its management is inadequately addressed.
6. **Highways:** This area already has high flows of traffic and this development, both at the construction stage and once completed will add to that . The approval of the quarry site at Bromley farm , adds a further 120 HGV movements per day and when taken with data presented to ward councillors in January 2024 which showed 176,000 vehicle movements over a three month period , with 23% exceeding the speed limit , is not acceptable on rural roads. Alongside this there have been developments on Barnsley road , Denby Dale and at Skelmanthorpe which have resulted in additional traffic and roads being used as rat runs. Application 2023/91280, for quarry development led KC Highways to conclude that using PICADY modelling the junction at the Sovereign crossroads were shown to be at or just above theoretical capacity during morning and evening peak times, this was without the associated development traffic from the quarry. Adding traffic from this site will severely impact the operation of the Sovereign junction leading to more road safety concerns. Councillors have been approached on many occasions to address the issues of Carr Hill Road and Cumberworth Lane being used by cars to divert from the Sovereign. With the closure of the Shepley Post office, the small post office in upper Cumberworth has absorbed that capacity , however at school times Cumberworth Lane is often impassable. This development will make this considerably worse.
7. **Public transport** : There is little in the way of public transport to live in upper Cumberworth you have to rely on a car. There is no doctors or dentist and so to attend appointments a car is necessary. The trains are little better, the line from Denby Dale is often closed and I have lost count of the times Ive needed to collect my god daughter from college in Barnsley . This is not a sustainable development. *Paragraph 8.24 of the Planning statement states “the site is situated in an extremely sustainable location for development and will reduce car dependency through the provision of convenient, safe and sustainable transport “this is false.* It goes on to state in 8.36 *“the site is in close proximity to employment opportunities and sustainable public transport links “.* This is also false.  
 In 4.1.4 of the Transport assessment, they state there is access to employment, education and leisure trips including shopping, suggesting these are walkable. The reality is there is one shop in the village, the Post Office and not open at weekends. Denby dale has a limited number of shops , but the walk back is a steep incline along a busy road . The calculation of only 44 vehicles leaving the site during morning peak is a gross underestimate for a development of 123 houses, which using UK National statistics is likely to generate 158,000 extra car journeys per annum. The Transport Assessment and travel plan submitted by the applicant contains substantial errors. Even the closest proposed boundary on Barnsley Road , the Train station is 1 km away ,

the whole of Denby Dale is not within 2km and the library is 2.3 km . People will use their car . This is far in Excess of Guidance for Planners.

8. **Proportionality:** Cumberworth is a small village of 390 houses, to propose to increase it by a third is unacceptable levels of development
9. **Housing Need:** While there is a need for housing across Kirklees this is not a local need. Each month between last June and current dates (February) - there are on average 80 homes for sale within three miles at a price of up to £250K. Many houses have been on the market for months. Building homes in a village with no amenities is not what is needed – refer to the recent University of Warwick research 2025. Homes are needed with good access to services and local amenities, Upper Cumberworth has one pub ( which has changed hands many times over the last few years, a post office and a school. The church shares a vicar with four other parishes and holds a service every three weeks. You cannot survive and thrive here without a car.

Lastly the consultation on this has been ridiculous. Vivly have refused to engage in any meaningful discussion, they wouldn't attend public meetings and when residents decided to tell them what they thought of proposals they criticised that as an exercise. Just what did they expect residents to do? They have written derogatory comments about, residents, councillors the MP and derided any concern.

We have been kept waiting for this application for around 9 months, with little from them – totally not in the spirit of effective communication. Any negative comments have been removed; they have only collected anything in their favour.

**Please do the right thing and refuse this application outside of the local plan and on Greenbelt.**