

Objection to planning reference 2018/91661

Please see attached objection to the above planning application.

Please review and consider especially the inaccuracies in the application that has been completed

Thank you

Objections relating to the inaccuracy of the application made

My initial objection starts in the inaccuracy of the submitted plan submitted fraudulently or incompetently and void the current application.

Section 12 Assessment of Flood Risk asks the below question:

Is your proposal within 20 metres of a watercourse (e.g. river, stream or beck)? No

There is a clear water source on the fields North East of the proposed development less than 20 metres away. The answer of this question is therefore incorrect and voids the submission of the planning application. No investigation and consideration of this water source has been completed and shows a failure to follow the correct process.

Section 15 of the assessment regards Trees and Hedges. Asks the below:

Are there trees or hedges on the proposed development site? No

Anyone with working eyes can see the area is full of hedges and living space for nature and wildlife. Making this declaration once again false.

And/or: Are there trees or hedges on land adjacent to the proposed development site that could influence the development or might be important as part of the local landscape character? No

The land adjacent to the north east edge of the planned development has trees and hedges and is a green space. This is a categorical error in the declaration on this document and therefore should void the whole application.

Other objections

Infrastructure/Traffic/Risk to life

Heckmondwike is already at close to breaking point if not broken in regards to the traffic and influx of vehicles both commuting and trade. Between peak times all back roads become rat runs and people will drive as fast as they can to skip traffic on the small back roads. You are adding 120 cars to an already crowded area that cannot sustain this increase. There will be a serious accident or fatality and this development the chances considerably.

The initial application was refused due to safety reasons upon safely accommodating the regular daily movement of the heavy goods vehicles needed to transport infill material to the site.

The only change to this application is that the infill will not take place on. The applicants cannot reasonably show that the reduction in vehicles including movement of worker, heavy plant, building materials and site management will decrease below a percentage that is deemed safe. In fact the

applicant has offered no data to show the vehicular impact before and after the change in their application therefore the data is unknown and incomparable.

An extract from the traffic report below shows the objectives and the stark contradiction that this development will cause.

<p>2.3. LOCAL PLANNING POLICY <i>The current Local Transport Plan is the third West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan (LTP3), which covers the period 2011 to 2016. The key objectives of the LTP3 include:</i></p>	
<p><i>To improve access to jobs, education and other key services for everyone;</i></p>	<p>More properties more cars reduction in access to jobs education and other key services for everyone</p>
<p><i>To reduce delays to the movement of people and goods;</i></p>	<p>Addition of more vehicles increase delays on already congested roads at peak times</p>
<p><i>To improve safety for all highway users;</i></p>	<p>Increase in vehicles by definition decreases safety including that of parked cars around schools affecting the risk to children's life's</p>
<p><i>To limit transport emissions of air pollutants, greenhouse gases and noise</i></p>	<p>By the pure increase in vehicles both during development and after the emissions of air pollutants, greenhouse gases and noise will increase considerably. By the removal of green space area you are removing the natural reduction of CO2 completed by nature.</p>

The below extract from the traffic report causes concern. The area is already overly congested yet this development will add to this during development and after.

<p>5.4. TRAFFIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT <i>Existing traffic on both Walkley Lane and High Street is currently congested at peak hours which results in queueing on both roads.</i></p>
--

Environmental/Pollution

Before the cars from potential residents have arrived just how many trucks do you think it will take to transport materials and plat to the site. This in itself coupled with the construction equipment and construction vehicles will cause astronomical disruption and pollution to the local area. We must consider the environment in these cases and this is not a viable area for development based solely on an ecological level. The area that is planned for development is teeming with life and this will be destroyed by the development. The surrounding area is also a wildlife area and the construction and then development and residency of families will cause disruption to local wildlife and ecosystem.

Schools/Risk to Children

Schools in the area are already oversubscribed with children missing out on their first place choices annually. You plan to put 74 dwellings onto the development. With a conservative estimate of 60% of those residents having at least one child that's 44 additional children to be found at a school and pushing out children already in the area. If we consider that more likely most families will have 2 children as is the norm that's 84 children to add to the oversubscription of children.

If the planning committee using a rational and visits the area surrounding the entrance to Horton Street and Church Road during school open and close times you will see the ridiculous amount of traffic, double parking and potential danger spots for children. There is no traffic management in these areas, no restrictions to parking and with these children already put at risk by cars. Your additional 74 houses adding at minimum 148 new cars increases this risk significantly.

Disused Mine/Structural risks

The fields to the north east of the development hold a disused mine that was sunk after use. No consideration has been taken to this mine and the impact a development of this type could have on subsidence of the existing properties in the area. No assessment has been made of this area and no plans have been provided to show how the development will be impacted by the surrounding mines. The use of the land mass within the site will not allow appropriate structural support from the adjacent land to the north east.

Loss of cycle path/loss of exercise area

By completing this development you are removing the current paths in place and in use by people to cycle and exercise. The plans state 'potential route for links to Urban Greenways, to be provided by others' not specifically just the nod to the fact the developer won't be helping with this and clearly doesn't care.

Flooding/Insurance increase

The development of this area to include residences would cause a significant flooding risk to the area including homes to the south west of the development and local businesses. Claims on insurances for such instances would increase all home insurances annually within that postcode area creating a financial impact on the area.

The assessment completed regarding the flooding and drainage asks more questions than it answers. This highlights a water source within the planning area but the path of this is unknown. The report actually highlights that further investigation is required to fully understand the impact on potential flooding.

There are culverted watercourses in the immediate vicinity of the site and a culvert crosses the site towards the north flowing from northeast to southwest along the back of houses to Horton Street before crossing the development under the former railway at depth. An investigation of the condition of the pipes will be required.