

Address: 4, FIELD HEAD FARM COURT, SHEPLEY, HUDDERSFIELD, HD8 8FH

About the application

Application number: 2026/92089	
What is the application for?:	Erection of single storey detached dwelling and associated access
Address of the site or building:	north of, 5, Field Head Farm Court, Shepley, Huddersfield, HD8 8FH
Postcode:	HD8 8FH

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	No
Objection to Planning Application 2026/92089	
I wish to object to the above planning application. I am a Chartered Architect and the occupier of the property immediately adjoining the application site. My principal objection is the loss of openness and the physical and visual intrusion of a new dwelling into what is presently open Green Belt garden land. The submitted elevations also appear to overstate the existing boundary hedge and understate how visible the dwelling would be. Further concerns relate to privacy, loss of sunlight to our garden, the safety of the proposed access, and the impact on the established hedgerow. Green Belt, openness and visual impact The site forms part of the open garden behind the established properties at Field Head Farm Court and extends towards the countryside beyond. The proposal would introduce a separate dwelling well behind the existing built form, together with a lengthy access, parking and turning areas, hardstanding and lighting. In my view this is backland development which extends residential built form into the open transition between the Court and the countryside and materially erodes the openness of the site. Residential development within this garden has previously been considered by two independent Planning Inspectors. Both identified harm from introducing permanent built form into this open land, with the later Inspector concluding there would be a moderate loss of openness. Although national Green Belt policy has changed, those site-specific findings remain relevant to the physical character and visual impact of the current proposal. A significant concern is the representation of the existing boundary hedge on the submitted elevations. Having compared the elevation with the scale information on the drawing and the existing condition on site, I do not consider the illustrated hedge	

drawing and the existing condition on site, I do not consider the illustrated hedge height to be accurate. The hedge appears materially higher than it is in reality, making the dwelling appear considerably more screened than it would actually be.

From our garden, a substantial proportion of the dwelling would remain visible above and through the vegetation, including during summer when the hedge is in full growth, and it would be more apparent still from our upper floor windows. The previous Inspector specifically noted that development on this site would remain visible from neighbouring upper floors and that the hedges could not reasonably be relied upon as permanent screening.

I ask that the hedge profile and relevant site levels are verified before the submitted elevations are relied upon. A section showing the proposed dwelling, actual hedge profile, adjoining garden and neighbouring property would provide a more accurate assessment.

Residential amenity and sunlight

The dwelling and its external amenity areas would be directly overlooked from our upper floor windows and from No. 77. This is not simply an objection based on loss of a view, but on the residential relationship created by the layout. The proposed house includes substantial glazing and relies heavily on existing vegetation for screening.

There is also a concern regarding loss of sunlight to our garden. The proposal would introduce permanent built form within the sun path to an area which currently benefits from an open aspect, yet I have not identified any meaningful shadow or sunlight assessment. Although the dwelling is single storey, its roof form, position and site levels are all relevant.

Access, parking and safety

Field Head Farm Court is a private, unadopted shared Court which already experiences significant parking pressure, with effectively no useful on-street parking available to residents. The principal shared parking area is immediately adjacent to the existing secondary gate serving No. 5, which is proposed to become the regular access to the new dwelling. Vehicles also park on the pavement opposite the gate due to parking pressure within the Court, and visitors rely on these same shared areas.

The submitted drawing shows the area around the proposed entrance as an unobstructed manoeuvring space. This is not representative of the Court in normal use. The application should show the existing parking arrangements and demonstrate how vehicles would enter, leave and manoeuvre when these areas are occupied.

This is also a busy pedestrian environment. Children regularly play within the Court, dog walkers and other pedestrians pass through the area, and recreational visitors park here to access nearby walking routes and the wider Trans Pennine Trail network. Turning the existing secondary gate into the regular vehicular access for a separate dwelling would introduce repeated emerging and manoeuvring movements at an already busy and constrained point, increasing conflict between moving vehicles, parked vehicles and pedestrians.

I request that the Highways Officer visits the site under representative occupied conditions before the application is determined. Photographs showing typical parking conditions can be provided on request.

Hedgerow and ecology

The proposed access would run immediately alongside an established hedgerow which forms an important landscape boundary and supports a wide variety of wildlife. I have personally found newts within the immediate vicinity. Construction and subsequent use could affect the hedge through ground works, drainage, compaction, headlights and increased activity. Retaining the hedge above ground does not demonstrate that its root environment, long-term condition or ecological function will be unaffected.

For these reasons I consider the proposal would result in inappropriate backland development, loss of openness, greater visual intrusion than shown on the submitted drawings, an unsatisfactory residential relationship and additional vehicular conflict within an already constrained shared Court. I therefore request that planning permission is refused.