

We wish to make the following observations and objections to the above application.

Why was the pre-application withdrawn following its deferral in the meeting on 28th April 2021?

- 1) The comments from the chair of the committee (that I witnessed at the time via live streaming) suggested that the pre-application was not up to standard and would take a lot of discussion. Hence the referral. As I understand it (following a conversation I had with the Planning Officer), the pre-application was withdrawn by the applicant. Apparently, the developer decided they did not want to wait any longer so submitted what they had straight to full planning application stage, even though the pre-application document raised a number of concerns and unresolved issues. According to the Planning officer nothing has changed from the pre-application proposal.
- 2) The Public Planning Notice displayed on Shepherds Thorne Lane is obscured and not in full view of local residents (being pinned to a random fence post half way down the lane and not at eye level)
- 3) The application submitted is vague and the only way to make any sense of it is to go through the 2 applications, 18 consultation responses, 56 Plans and 86 supporting information which are in no particular order (some of which run into tens of pages and the scale of drawings and plans are unclear). It is little wonder that most residents take one look at this and give up especially when all the other developments in the area being given the go ahead.
- 4) I had to contact the ID Consultants as the exiting residents had not been informed / given feedback of the outcome of the consultation that they undertook in March 2021. I was advised the outcome was contained in a report which had been filed as an additional document with the planning application. I found it eventually, randomly placed in the middle of the rest of the documents. Contained in this document was the statement ***“To be clear, consultation is not being undertaken on the wider balance of the HS11 Allocation site including the Golf Course owned by the Council as no planning application is being submitted for the wider site at this time”***. Surely the wider implications need to be included in any consultation and planning. Also, if this is the case why have they submitted drawings that do include the wider plan.

We object to this development and request that at best it is rejected and at worst it is deferred until a proper plan is in place, especially with regard to: -

- 1) Scale of Development
- 2) Highways
- 3) Education and Health places being made available
- 4) Drainage & Flood Risk
- 5) Environment
- 6) Ecology
- 7) Residential Amenity
- 8) Loss of Outlook
- 9) Short timescale proposed for commencement

1) Scale of development:

- Development is too dense and would disproportionately increase the size of Bradley
- Housing does not appear to be for the benefit of the local Community (I would refer the panel to the following Brochure <https://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/place-to-make-it/index.aspx> (extract below). This quite clearly sets out that Huddersfield is looking to attract not only businesses but people to the area. Therefore, it should be argued that this development is not essential housing for local people but part of the larger plan to increase the population of Kirklees.
- Loss of Green Belt land
- Loss of green space and recreational opportunities
- Design of housing out of keeping with surrounding existing houses

2) Highways:

- Impact of increased traffic on local highway network including key junctions
- Local highway network cannot accommodate the additional traffic
- Detrimental impact on highway safety
- Cumulative highway effects with other developments in the area (Pennine Business Park, Tithe House Way, Fixby & Rastrick developments already underway)
- Both of the proposed access points are unsuitable and dangerous
- Impact of construction traffic and development traffic on Bradford Road, Bradley Road, and Potentially Shepherds Thorne Lane (already being seen by the developments that are underway at Fixby & Rastrick)
- Shepherds Thorne Lane is unsuitable to accommodate the additional traffic of cycles and pedestrians
- Creating a walk way and cycle lane on land adjacent to Shepherds Thorn Lane is ambitious given it is such a narrow strip of scrub land and is going to massively impact the existing residents at 396 & 398 Bradley Road & 2 Shepherds Thorne Lane, (two of which have direct access to their properties on the Lane and there are potential hazards if these accesses are crossed by a pedestrian walkway & Cycle Lane). I can provide pictures which show that in order to achieve what is being proposed the following would have to be removed / relocated: Lamp Post (newly installed) a Junction box (newly installed by City Fibre), an established Laurel hedge which sits in private property and shrub land which is used as a passing point if vehicles are moving in both directions on the lane.
- Request for a Traffic Regulation Order for Shepherds Thorne Lane to prevent the site being used as cut through and thus increasing the amount of traffic on Bradley Road and beyond that is generated by this development alone
- Use of Shepherds Thorne Lane for access will harm the amenity and safety of existing residents on Bradley Road and infringe upon their Human Rights - **reference consultation report which suggests it could be possible for Lane to be used by construction vehicles** (Question "Will Shepherds Thorn Lane be used for construction vehicles?" Response: This would be determined via a Construction Management Plan which is usually conditioned to a Planning Application. It is likely that construction traffic will use the existing farm access from Bradford Road in the first instance). Concern that the proposed access off Bradford Road will not be constructed and all traffic will have to go into Brighthouse to come back up to Bradley Bar roundabout
- Public transport infrastructure inadequate to support this development Internal road layout could cause parking problems
- Proposed right turn lane off Bradford Road is dangerous given how busy this road is and traffic speeds Risk that the development will cause other local roads to be used as rat runs

3) Education and Health:

- What places are being made available to accommodate the increase in the number of local residents (talk of a future primary school, but only if wider development goes ahead and that could be a long way off, no mention of Secondary Schools, GP's, Dentists, Hospitals etc.)
- According to recent figures published there are limited school places available and first year intake in most cases is oversubscribed.
- There are waiting lists to join most GP and Dental practices
- Hospitals are overrun and have massive back log and years long waiting lists (if press reports are to be believed)

4) Drainage and flood risk:

- Concern that the development will increase the risk of flooding to existing property adjacent to the site and the reports confirm there is a Risk albeit they claim low, but a risk is a risk (**what does this mean exactly and what happens when our insurance premiums are increased**)

due the potential flood risk? Where will the developer be then? Long gone and no come back to them, just on to the next development).

- There is a natural spring / watercourse in the field near Torcote Crescent.
- Adjacent property has recently experienced flooding
- Existing fields become saturated in winter and parts of them have flooded (I have pictures if you need to see them)
- Cumulative flood risk effects with other developments in the area (Bradley Golf Course & Tithe Way Developments)
- Impact of vegetation removal on the flood risk does not appear to have been considered – since the placement of Bore Holes & the archaeological dig the excess water that has run off the Villa Farm fields has resulted in degradation of Shepherd Thorne Lane and created rivulets which run all the way down to the bottom of the lane.

5) Environment Issues

- Why are world leaders, including our own Prime Minister Boris Johnson, and naturalists like David Attenborough (and most people if news reels are to be believed) insisting the world needs to change its consumption habits if we are to ensure its survival. Yet developers seem to be exempt from this.
- Kirklees Council have published their plans to tackle the Climate Emergency, which seems to be at odds with their expansion plans (<https://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/climate-emergency/index.aspx>) see extract below. How can you possibly expect to reduce emissions when the housing developments continue to increase?

Why we must act now –

We declared a climate emergency in 2019 because we all must take urgent action to improve and protect our environment. Greenhouse gases such as carbon dioxide trap heat, helping to warm the globe. The amount of carbon emissions is now causing an overall warming of the planet with corresponding devastating impacts starting to be felt. Cases of extreme weather such as heat waves and rainfall are having consequences already in Kirklees with issues such as moorland fires and flooding in particular affecting the region.

Our 2038 carbon neutral vision Our vision is to make Kirklees completely carbon neutral by 2038. This will mean carbon emissions from human activities in Kirklees will need to be dramatically reduced to zero with any remaining emissions safely removed from the atmosphere. This can also be referred to as achieving 'net zero' carbon emissions by 2038.

- Building more houses in areas that are already over populated and creaking at the seams due to lack of good transport infrastructure, lack of school places, waiting lists and times to get into see GPs and Dentists, extremely long waiting times in NHS hospitals for even the most basic procedures. And yet someone has deemed it necessary to build over 2000 homes in the local vicinity of Bradley.
- These developments are adding more traffic to the road networks and installing electric charging points does in no way mitigate against the additional pollution created as most people that buy these houses will not have to have an electric vehicle.

6) Ecology:

- The majority of the allocated site is within a Biodiversity Opportunity Zone (Mid-Altitudinal Grasslands for most of the site, Built-up Areas for a small part of the west end of the site, and Valley Slopes along the site's north eastern boundary). Bats are known to be present in the area
- Detrimental impact on flora and fauna including owls, bats, foxes, herons
- Loss of habitat
- Impact on the 'hedgerow', trees and natural stone walls that form the boundary
- Loss of existing trees and hedgerows on the site
- Impact on the function of the site as a green corridor
- Net loss to biodiversity

7) Residential amenity:

- Impact of construction phase on local residents i.e. noise, dust, disruption, increase in construction traffic and HGV's etc. (I am already being woken around 6.30am by the sound of dumper trucks taking excavated waste down Bradley Road from Fixby/Rastrick to local quarry / Land fill)
- Concern with length of time it will take to build, (especially as the road infrastructure is yet to be put in place).
- Detrimental impact on air quality from increased traffic and slower traffic speeds/stationary traffic. Already an air quality issue in this area and this proposal will exacerbate this problem.
- Cumulative air pollution effects with other developments in the area
- The allocated site is not located within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA), however it is relatively close to AQMA 1 (Bradley Road / Leeds Road junction), **where elevated levels of Nitrogen Dioxide have been measured**
- Insufficient local amenities to serve a development of this scale

8) Loss of outlook

- Overshadowing/Impact on natural light (right to light)
- Light pollution from dwellings
- Overlooking of existing properties - Increased noise pollution
- Noise & Air pollution from adjacent M62 would affect this development

9) Short timescale proposed for commencement

- given that the developer has stated "Subject to a timely planning approval and legal agreements, it is envisaged that development will commence on site late 2021/ early 2022 with houses starting to complete 2022/2023 as best estimate". Especially as there is no specifics on the phasing of the construction that I can find and which was mentioned as a concern in the Pre-planning application report.

Other matters:

- Increased pressure on schools and medical service providers. Cumulative impact with other developments must be taken into account.
- Inadequate infrastructure and amenities to support the additional housing proposed
- Open space is inadequate/unsuitable
- Inadequate investigation of coal mining legacy, water courses and land stability/subsidence concerns
- Impact of construction on stability of adjacent properties
- Detrimental impact on property values
- Power and essential services such as water and gas will be compromised

Applicant's Statement of Community Involvement is poor and misleading; concerns with applicant's engagement with local community

- Mental wellbeing of existing residents which is already being stretched given other developments in the area and the added strain of the effect of the pandemic was met with what I would regard at dismissive (see consultation report - question by residents "The development will detrimentally affect the mental health of existing residents" and the **Response: No details were provided why this was felt to be the case**). **I would suggest whoever responded should come and spend a day in our shoes, even though our houses are double glazed there is constant road noise**
- How is access to the public footpaths maintained
- Impact on climate change
- There is not demand for this amount of housing
- Development may increase crime

There are too many unanswered questions and anomalies with regards to drainage, flooding, mining and land fill, transport and environmental, all the reports are based on future actions being carried out and the and conditions of the Masterplan.

Although this application is for 270 units it is still part of the overall Master Plan HS111 which has so many unresolved issues, so surely it cannot be possible to agree this development as a stand-alone project when it is reliant on the overall plan in terms of infrastructure.

We already know that the Masterplan development was reliant on government approval and funding for a new slip road off the M62 at Bradley Bar, a new trunk road that would run through the Bradley Gold Course Development and down to a new bypass at Cooper Bridge. All have which have been refused. Although an alternative plan has been suggested to ease traffic at the junction with Bradley Road and Leeds Road this is not going to reduce the amount of Traffic.

Currently there are so many HGV's, Construction vehicles servicing the developments, Buses and cars, especially during pick up and drop off at school and in rush hour when the traffic comes to a standstill. This not only creates a lot of noise but also increases the pollution as fumes are being pumped out.

We feel this a poor application, and the developer has ignored feedback from the local community, which we feel has been a whitewash and box ticking exercise on their part, where they claim to have had a consultation. This is certainly not our interpretation of a consultation.

The lack of response to the Council Officers concerns and those of the local residents reinforces this view. Which we find dismissive and uncaring.

Given all of the issues listed above, on behalf of my friends, neighbours and local community (we have spoken with), we would like to register a very **strong objection** to the application no.2021/92086.