
From:**Sent:** 19 September 2020 18:55**To:** Victor Grayson <Victor.Grayson@kirklees.gov.uk>**Subject:** Objection

Dear Sir,

My wife and I wish to strongly object to

Please note our comments equally apply to **application 2020/92331 - Land east of Leeds Road, Chidswell.**

These proposals represent a significant part of **a disproportionate concentration of development in this area** and a punitive and similarly disproportionate burden on the several local (and currently quite separate) communities involved/ affected.

The **level of housing provision** (recently built, being built, applied for, or allocated in the Adopted Local Plan) **for the immediate area** is simply staggering.

This may not even be an exhaustive list, however:

School Street, Chickenley	49 dwellings
Long Lane, Earlsheaton	15
Preston Street, Earlsheaton	40
Providence Street, Earlsheaton	30
Rumble Road, Bywell	149
Lady Ann Road, Soothill	97
Pavilion Close, Soothill	40 (?)
Soothill Lane, Lower Soothill	393
Owl Lane, Amberwood Chase	206
Owl Lane, Barratt Homes	252

Lees House Farm, Leeds Road	38
Chidswell, Leeds Road	1,354
Heybeck Lane	181

In the region of **2,850 new dwellings!** This notwithstanding any **additional proposals by the neighbouring authorities of Wakefield and Leeds**. These include (again not exhaustive) Old Thorpe Lane (207), East Ardsley/ Haigh Wood (299) - for the time being rejected - and Tingley Station (currently suggested as being safeguarded land until post 2028) but with a capacity for a further 1,050 dwellings!

All this housing development, whilst not forgetting that the situation is further compounded by proposals for business use of **up to 35 Ha./ 86.49 acres** on part of the **Chidswell site**, which had been previously estimated as able to support **122,500 sq. m./ 1,318,579 sq. ft. of employment space**. In addition to the necessary staff/ visitor parking to support this use, this business use will obviously generate large service/ articulated lorry vehicle traffic, potentially on a 24/7 basis.

The immediate road - the A653 Leeds Road in particular - and wider highway network currently struggles to cope and often fails especially, though not exclusively, at peak times.

We note that the consultation response from **Highways England** has asked for the applicant to provide further assessment and modelling work to assess **the impact on a cumulative and cross boundary basis on the Strategic Road Network** - junction 28 of the M62 and junctions 40 and 41 of the M1 motorways.

We trust that Kirklees Council Highways Team have taken/ are taking a similarly holistic and rigorous approach when considering **the cumulative and cross boundary impact on the local road network**.

The **irrevocable loss of a vast area of greenbelt** is another major concern. The loss of quality agricultural land, together with the greenbelt's associated **recreational and amenity value** - Covid 19 has demonstrated how important and necessary these areas are for our physical and mental wellbeing - would transform this area's existing character from **rural/ semi-rural into an urban sprawl**, which the original designation was designed and intended to protect us against. Chickenley, Earlsheaton, Hanging Heaton, Shaw Cross, Chidswell, Soothill, the Babes in the Wood, East and West Ardsley all merging into one huge area. At some point in the future we are convinced that the Church of England/ Church Commissioners will look to maximise their asset (profit) by seeking further development on the balance of their land ownership within the Wakefield District boundary. This would then firmly add Gawthorpe to the list of **lost communities**.

The inevitable adverse impact on the **ancient woodlands** (a proposed 20m. - approximately four car lengths - buffer zone by way of protection - really, seriously!) and the **myriad of local wildlife** is a similar major concern. We note that the _____ have submitted an **objection** to both Heybeck Lane and Chidswell due to **significant district impacts upon Local Wildlife Sites and the Kirklees Wildlife Habitat Network**. This due to the **impacts of these and other nearby developments upon sensitive habits, species and ecological connectivity**.

If approved the proposals for Heybeck Lane and Chidswell (not forgetting the other sites

mentioned above) would result in significant increased levels of **air and noise pollution** and other environmental issues during construction and permanently thereafter.

Other objectors have provide details highlighting, amongst other issues: that **local schools are all at, or over capacity** (objector 822888) and that the **Kirklees patient to GP provision is already above the national average**, whilst also questioning the adequacy of **existing public utilities** (objector 822880).

In passing and just by way of the detail. Should the red line site boundary for the Heybeck Lane application:

include the two proposed surface water connections to the existing watercourse, include an alternative access for emergency service vehicles only. Currently the assumption would appear to be that the Chidswell application is already approved and that the road layout associated with that application will provide the emergency access for the Heybeck site?

We trust that our objections will be given due consideration.

Regards,