

**From:**  
**To:** [DCAdmin](#)  
**Subject:**  
**Date:** 05 October 2020 10:38:42

---

## Proposed development **20/92331 Chidswell**

The Kirklees plan is unbalanced since it is a plan for economic prosperity at the expense of people and place. The proposals for NE Kirklees will not create economic prosperity for the area. The developments will encourage buyers from the affluent cities of Manchester and Leeds where property prices are out of reach for some first time buyers and with access to motorways, they will commute. The satellite towns of Dewsbury and Batley are already in economic decline. The satellite towns get left behind at the expense of economic growth for larger towns and cities. Development in NE Kirklees will provide prosperity to the city of Leeds. A sustainable economic plan is needed to regenerate Dewsbury and Batley town centres first and foremost.

Replacing a visually stimulating natural landscape will bring increased stressors to residents creating mental and physical health problems.

*NPPF180. Planning policies and decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. In doing so they should: a) mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development – and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life; b) identify and protect tranquil areas which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason; and c) limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.*

The site is situated to the east of the A653. KMC has removed this area from the Greenbelt. It is high quality agricultural land; two farms are located on the site Heybeck and Windsor. Dum Wood and Dogloitch wood are both ancient protected woodland and recently received Local Wildlife Status. The site also has protected hedgerows and trees. UK BAP Priority Species are present on the site i.e.

At Fulton Dam EA Nature Site fed by Heybeck, Bushy Beck, and other water courses.)

*The Environmental Statement (ES), identifies that “major negative impacts” are predicted during the construction phase of the development and “minor negative impacts” are predicted during the operational phase of the development to the assemblage of breeding farmland birds currently recorded utilising the site. In particular both of which are Kirklees BAP species suffering notable declines due to loss of habitat. A disregard of these impacts, even if considered minor, is not in accordance with local Plan Policy LP30 (i) which states that development proposals are required to “result in no significant loss or harm to biodiversity in Kirklees through avoidance, adequate mitigation or, as a last resort, compensatory measures secured through the establishment of a legally binding agreement.”*

The loss of green, open space, providing access to footpaths, the Leeds and Kirklees Country Ways promoting health and wellbeing for the community.

The proposal of the above will have far reaching consequences to NE Kirklees during remedial work, infrastructure changes and the proposed housing and industrial development. Car emissions and particulates may lead to an increase in child leukaemia, asthma, heart and respiratory disease in the young and elderly. Dangerous [air pollutants](#), nitrogen dioxide, sulphur dioxide and particulates are mainly produced by factories, industrial sites, and traffic fumes.

Pollution can stay in the air for days or even weeks especially if the air is still and there's no wind to blow it away. BUSY MAIN ROADS-Levels of nitrogen dioxide and particulates are higher on busy urban roads, particularly when traffic is moving slowly.

Listed below are applications which will have a cumulative cross boundary impact on the A653, A638, B6128, Challenge Way, B6124 and other

residential roads in the area. M1 junctions 41, 42 and M62 junction 29.

Kirklees Planning Applications:

2020/92331	1354 dwellings, 35 hectares employment development
2020/92350	181 dwellings
2019/92787	280 dwellings
2018/94189	366 dwellings (application approved)

**Vehicle Access: 92350.** 181 dwellings (most dwellings have more than 1 car.)

It is proposed to provide vehicular access and egress into and out of Site 92350 in the form of a priority T junction on Heybeck Lane (B Road.) This will cause congestion, poor air quality, standing traffic (causing exhaust fumes and particulates to enter the air,) disregard for road and pedestrian safety. The site has only one road feeding in and out of the development. I question the access and egress of emergency vehicles. At peak times access and egress will be challenging, turning left towards Leeds Road creating congestion at the Babes traffic lights and right towards Wakefield. *Through pre-application conversations and an agreed scoping note, dated 11th November 2019, Site access arrangements have been discussed extensively and agreed in principle with KC highways officers.* These arrangements should be reviewed due to the concern of local residents.

**Leeds Road: 92331. 1354 dwellings, 35 hectares employment**

**development** Vehicular access and egress in and out of 92331 is proposed in the form of two single-controlled junctions **on** Leeds Road. Causing congestion, poor air quality, standing traffic (causing exhaust fumes and particulates to enter the air,) disregard for road and pedestrian safety. The levels of Leeds Road differ. The access points on Leeds Road from the industrial estate, school and development will not be free flowing even with proposed traffic signalling systems. *Through pre-application conversations and an agreed scoping note, dated 11th November 2019, Site access arrangements have been discussed extensively and agreed in principle with KC highways officers.* These arrangements should be reviewed due to the

concern of local residents.

Chidswell Lane access point is on the brow of a hill with poor visibility for turning, leading to standing traffic and congestion. Traffic on Chidswell Lane is busy as it is used to access Owl Lane via Windsor Road. Has any pre-application conversations taken place regarding this junction?

The A653 narrows at Shaw Cross where there is an infant school. Congestion and standing traffic will increase air pollution around the school which is situated near to the A653. Has any pre-application conversations taken place regarding this junction?

**Chidswell Lane and Owl Lane** Vehicular access and egress in and out of 92331 is, a priority T-junction on Chidswell Lane, and a four-arm roundabout on Owl Lane with a new access road running parallel to Windsor Road between Owl Lane and the southern edge of the Site. This access road would route across an adjacent landholding under the control of Barratt David Wilson Homes to the south west of the Site. The spine road takes traffic from 92331 through a housing development - potential danger to pedestrians and traffic accidents. Increase air pollution from exhaust fumes in an estate occupied possibly by adults with young children.

The proposed development does not conform to:

*NPPF 109 Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.*

**Highways** *The West Yorkshire Combined Authority (WYCA) West Yorkshire Transport Strategy 2040 (2017) The West Yorkshire Transport Strategy created following public consultation during 2016, sets out a vision and a framework to deliver a high-class, modern, integrated transport system. The Strategy covers the period between 2016- 2036 and was jointly produced by West Yorkshire Combined Authority and the West Yorkshire District Councils.*

*To realise our ambitions for the region, the transport strategy must address the following objectives:*

- *Economy: Create a more reliable, less congested, better connected transport network*
- *Environment: Have a positive impact on our built and natural*

*environment*

- *People & Place: Put people first to create a strong sense of place*

**The proposed disproportionate housing growth in NE Kirklees does not adhere to the above objectives**

The current Local Transport Plan is the third West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan (LTP3), which covers the period 2011 to 2026

The key objectives of the LTP3 include

*To improve access to jobs, education and other key services for everyone*  
**(local schools oversubscribed, congested road network will not improve travel to employment.)**

*To reduce delays to the movement of people and goods* **(delays will incur reducing movement of goods and people which will effect local economies.)**

*To improve safety for all highway users* **(substantial increase in traffic will increase accident risk to pedestrians, cyclists and road users.)**

*To limit transport emissions of air pollutants, greenhouse gases and noise*  
(increase in **transport will increase air pollutants and gases as well as noise.**)

*To improve the condition of the highway infrastructure.*

Highways England quote” Development of sites 92331/92350 has the potential for a significant impact on the Strategic Road Network.

**URBAN SPRAWL** The development encroaches on to Wakefield MCC and Leeds City boundaries which prevents a green barrier between the conurbations and does not conform to the NPPF.

**SCHOOLS** The Chidswell development shows only the inclusion of a Primary School would this include Childcare places? The proposed development will attract families with older children; present schools in the area are oversubscribed. The Master plan does not identify provision of land for a new secondary school.

**HEALTH** Doctors' surgeries could not cope with an increase in population, no new proposals for a medical centre

**COAL LEGACY** Developers will be responsible for remedial work to both sites before any ground work preparations can commence. The Coal Authority has advised quote “\* the submission of a layout plan that identifies appropriate zones of influence of the mine entries affecting this site, and the definition of suitable ‘no-build’ zones;

\* The submission of a scheme of treatment for the mine entries on site for approval;

\* The submission of a scheme of remedial works for the shallow coal workings for approval;

\* Implementation of those remedial works.”

If the sites contains a significant legacy of past coal mining activity (i.e. mine entries, underground, voids at shallow depths etc.) The developer may decide that removing the remnant coal by prior extraction is the safest and most viable method of land remediation prior to development. The key issue is that appropriate evidence must be submitted with the planning application. Kirklees Council should not grant planning permission until conclusive investigations suggested by the Coal Authority are completed.

does not conform to guidelines. Further s should be carried out before planning permission is granted. The was dated March 2018. A more conclusive and up to date survey should be commissioned. *Refer to Kirklees Ecology document 827762. This document refers to planning applications 2020-92331 and 2020/92350.*

carried out in September the ditches were dry during that month. Survey did not include Heybeck where surface water and pollutants from the proposed development would enter and where water voles are present.

**ANCIENT WOODLAND** Dogloitch wood and Dum Wood are Local Wildlife Sites. Both woods can be identified in the 1847 ordnance survey map. The woods will lose their natural water source and would cause the woods to dry. Loss of protected trees and hedgerows for wildlife, especially for the . Hedgerows and woods will both be at risk from

vandalism from the proposed developments and will never recover. Light pollution will have a severe affect on the . Hedgerow 7 is situated to the east of the Primary school drop off zone. Hedgerow 9 is situated SE of Dum wood bordering remaining greenbelt south of Heybeck Farm. Hedgerow 28 is situated to the east of the entrance on to Heybeck Lane. The above mentioned hedgerows ('important' under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997') will be destroyed during development. Quote: *Brooks Survey "the remaining hedgerows, although not qualifying as Important, will all meet the criteria for Habitat of Principle Importance under the NERC Act 2006 and Priority Habitat under the local BAP. On this basis, the scheme should aim for a 'no net loss' in hedgerow cover, with the landscape plan incorporating an equal or greater amount of diverse, native hedgerow to that that is lost. Wherever feasible, the preference should be to retain, protect and enhance existing hedgerows in situ"*.

The majority of the remaining hedgerows fall into the development at Heybeck and the Industrial estate. Five others are on the larger Chidswell site. The hedgerows will be destroyed during development. The hedgerow pattern in this area is over 170 years old and can clearly be seen in the 1847 ordnance survey map.

**Quote: Arboriculture Impact Assessment** *"Within the original survey (which covered both 'Land to the East of Leeds Road' and the 'land at Heybeck Lane' application sites) revealed fifty-eight individual trees, one hedgerow and thirty-three tree groups were surveyed including those just outside the Site boundary. The majority of the trees and tree groups were assessed as high quality (retention category A). Thirty-four individual trees, one hedgerow and thirty groups of these trees are situated within the Site referred to as 'Land at the East of Leeds Road Chidswell'. The trees on site are in a good condition and provide a high amenity to the surrounding area."*

*Potential development should avoid disturbance to the below ground root protection area (RPA) of a tree as well as the above ground stem and canopy. The effects of shading by new buildings can have a detrimental effect on tree health. Drainage, sewerage, attenuation tanks and utility trenches should also avoid RPA's*

*Where possible higher quality trees (retention categories A and B), should be retained within a development. Retaining as many trees as possible has*

many benefits including wellbeing, visual amenity, contributing to sustainable drainage, help in preventing soil erosion and providing wildlife habitats.

**Kirklees Consultation Document i.d.826554 Trees** the document does not identify Dum Wood and Dogloitch Wood as Local Wildlife Sites, the document recommends the woods be opened up for public access.

Quote from Yorkshire Wildlife Trust i.d. 825166:

*Local Wildlife Sites There are two Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) which abut the proposed development. LWS (formerly known as Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation) are of great significance as core wildlife-rich habitats of substantive nature conservation value and taken together with Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), they represent a major national asset, essential to nature's recover. LWS play a critical conservation role by providing wildlife refuges, acting as stepping stones, corridors and buffer zones to link and protect nationally and internationally designated sites – improving ecological coherence and connectivity and contributing to a climate resilient landscape. With no statutory status, their only form of protection is through good planning policy and decisions.*

*Many LWS are of SSSI quality and together with the statutorily protected sites, contain most of the country's remaining high quality natural habitat and threatened species. Regardless of statutory status, it is absolutely paramount, that the countries core sites for biodiversity are protected from developmental loss and damage, if we are to avoid a net loss in biodiversity.*

***The presence of a LWS, should always serve as a red flag that the application is highly likely to be damaging and alternative sites should be sought.***

*The ES has considered the impacts to these sites to be significant and thus recommended the incorporation of a buffer from construction activities (14.102), which we welcome; however we do not feel this goes far enough to protect the sites and would be encouraged to see, as a minimum, the implementation of a planted buffer rather than a fence line only. This should be detailed within the CEMP.*

*Whilst we also welcome the consideration of a 'Woodland Management Plan' (14.115 and 14.145) to ameliorate the impacts of increased*

*disturbance during operation of the site, we fear this is highly inadequate to mitigate for the significant impacts assessed to be of district importance. The Trust undertook research on our own reserves in 2017/2 to identify the impacts from nearby development; it demonstrated a wide range of types of impact which increased with development proximity.*

*We would therefore be more encouraged to see the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green space (SANGs) as outlined by Natural England's 'Nature Nearby' to limit increased access and disturbance of LWS and provide alternative locations for the community. The LWS should be further supported by suitable buffers from the development. This would represent correct application of the mitigation hierarchy (avoid, minimise, mitigate) and industry good practice. The Woodland Management Plan should then be revised to consider the designation features of the sites with the aim to retain and enhance their value. It is imperative that good design and management proposals are provided prior to determination of any phase adjacent to the LWS and KWHN to ensure the district level impact has been appropriately compensated. Due to the significance of these sites, this must be outlined in more detail prior to the determination of this application.*

*NPPF 175 c) development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy exists*

*Kirklees Council Ecology Document Local Wildlife Sites : At present, the pathways within the woodlands are unmade and undefined, and there is a risk of ground flora trampling due to increased usage, therefore either limitation or adequate management of public access to the woodlands will be required as recommended within 14.145 of the ES. As stated by Yorkshire Wildlife, appropriate open space will also need to be provided within the development site in order to reduce pressure on the LWS's.*