

## DC Admin

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 19 February 2026 22:45  
**To:** DC Admin  
**Subject:** Objection Upper Cumberworth 2025/60/93572/E

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

**Re: Objection to Proposed Development of 123 Dwellings on Land at Barnsley Road: 2025/60/93572/**

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write to formally object to the proposed development of 123 houses on land at Barnsley Road. I have been a resident of Upper Cumberworth for almost eight years and currently reside on Barnsley Road. This village is special and has a real sense of community - as you will probably find with the amount of objections you are likely to receive. The green belt land should be protected at all costs.

### **1. Inappropriate Development in the Green Belt – Conflict with National Planning Policy**

The application site lies within designated Green Belt. Under the **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**, the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. Paragraphs 137–151 of the NPPF make clear that inappropriate development in the Green Belt is, by definition, harmful and should not be approved except in “very special circumstances.”

No such very special circumstances have been demonstrated that would clearly outweigh the significant and permanent harm caused by the loss of openness and encroachment into the countryside. Furthermore, the proposal appears contrary to the adopted Local Plan policies protecting Green Belt land.

Approval would undermine both national and local planning policy and set a dangerous precedent for further erosion of protected countryside.

### **2. Traffic Generation, Highway Safety & Air Quality**

Barnsley Road already experiences considerable traffic flow, speeding vehicles, and recorded road traffic incidents. The introduction of 123 dwellings would generate a substantial increase in vehicle movements, placing additional strain on an already pressured road network.

In the eight years I have lived here I have witnessed numerous collisions and near misses, particularly near the post office area due to speeding drivers and people using handheld mobile phones.

Increased traffic would result in:•

- Heightened risk of accidents•
- Greater danger to pedestrians and cyclists•
- Increased congestion•
- Higher levels of noise pollution•

Deterioration in local air qualityThis is inconsistent with the NPPF’s objectives of promoting safe and sustainable transport and creating healthy communities.

### **3. Impact on Wildlife, Biodiversity & Ancient Woodland**

The site and surrounding land support a wide range of wildlife, including birds, squirrels, bats and deer. Development would result in habitat loss, fragmentation, light pollution and increased disturbance.

Of particular concern is the proximity to ancient woodland and local conservation areas. The NPPF is explicit that ancient woodland is an irreplaceable habitat and should be afforded the highest level of protection. Indirect impacts — including recreational pressure, lighting, pollution and drainage changes — must also be fully considered.

The proposal risks significant biodiversity harm and appears contrary to national policy requiring measurable biodiversity net gain.

My family walks with the dog daily and this development poses a real threat to the quality of life for existing village residents.

### **4. Pressure on Local Infrastructure & Services**

The village’s infrastructure is limited and already under strain. Local schools operate near capacity, healthcare services are stretched, and community facilities are limited. The addition of 123 homes would significantly increase demand without clear, deliverable mitigation measures in place.

The NPPF requires development to be supported by adequate infrastructure. At present, this requirement does not appear satisfied.

### **5. Drainage, Sewerage & Flood Risk**

Existing residents are aware of ongoing drainage and sewer capacity concerns, particularly during periods of heavy rainfall. The development would replace permeable greenfield land with hardstanding and built form, increasing surface water runoff.

Without robust and demonstrably deliverable drainage solutions, there is a clear risk of exacerbating flooding and overloading existing sewer infrastructure.

### **6. Loss of Landscape Character & Village Identity**

The open green fields along Barnsley Road form part of the rural setting and identity of the village. Their loss would fundamentally alter the character of the area. The countryside and views were the very reason we moved here to raise our family. We particularly paid attention to the Local Plan, and we were comforted that the fields were protected by the green belt, please do not sell away the countryside to a developer that already has unfinished houses underway in neighbouring villages.

A development of 123 houses represents overdevelopment of this site and is wholly disproportionate to the scale of the existing settlement. It would urbanise a small village environment and erode its distinctiveness.

For the reasons set out above — conflict with the **National Planning Policy Framework**, harm to the Green Belt, biodiversity impacts, increased traffic danger, strain on infrastructure, drainage concerns and irreversible loss of rural character — I respectfully urge the Council to refuse this application.

Yours faithfully,

Please ensure my name and address are kept confidential and my comments are published anonymously.

Sent from my iPhone