

dc.admin@kirklees.gov.uk

planning refs: 2020/92350 & 2020/92331.

To whom it may concern

I am emailing to object to the above planning applications

I bought my house, because it looks over onto the fields at the back of Leeds Road and was informed that it was 'green belt land'. I regularly take my dog for a walk and photograph the wonderful wildlife including woodpeckers barn owls, king fisher, heron foxes and other wildlife. I also enjoy watching the farmer plough the fields from which he makes a living and watching the crops grow. This will all be lost for myself and other residents if the planning application were to go ahead.

There is already queueing traffic on Leeds Road at peak times and this road would not cope with increased traffic. There are many potholes and larger holes in the road which have not been addressed. The surface would be even worse with increased traffic.

There will be permanent loss of agricultural land. Natural England have requested site-specific surveys to assess the quality of the land but the Land Owner (Church Commissioners for Church of England) has refused to do so. The Land Owner states that the need for new housing and employment outweighs the loss of agricultural land. The Planning Department have admitted they do not know if the land is of better agricultural value than the Land Owner claims and it appears there are no plans to conduct the assessments repeatedly requested by Natural England

Along with the other birds I have mentioned there will be permanent displacement of endangered Skylark & Yellow Hammer which breed on the land in large numbers. I understand that years out-of-date Ecological Surveys have been 'updated' by one single walk-over by an Ecologist (employed by Land Owner) in October 2022 after a drought-this is not sufficient to get a true picture.

Biodiversity Net Gain report (based on October Ecologist walk-over) claims the development will deliver 10% more biodiversity than in its current state. A previous Biodiversity Net Gain report, based on exact same conditions, was assessed at 14% Net Loss so how do the same plans increase by 24%? The net loss in 2020 was advised independently by Yorkshire Wildlife Trust but it appears the Planning Department and Land Owner have ignored the comments made by the YWT Ecologist.

The Land Owner has dismissed evidence to say the species are only foraging on site and not resident. The Kingfisher has been recorded regularly on the waterway just below the site and if waterways become polluted it will lose its feeding ground. This is not being considered in the planning process currently.

Bats have been reported by the Land Owner's Ecologist as having 'no significant activity on site'. There have been over 9,000 verified recordings of bat calls in and around the 2 Ancient Woodlands

If the planning is approved there will be an Impact on climate change – woods, fields, streams and fields contribute to climate resilience and act as a cool zone. Changes to land use affect its health and ability to fight climate change

One of my other major concerns is loss of local amenity with positive benefits on mental health for myself and other residents.

I am very concerned that there will be damage to Ancient Woodlands: Dum & Dogloitch Woods – the surrounding buffer has been identified as too small to prevent damage to the Woodlands. Not building on woods won't stop them being destroyed. There are other impacts that will cause the death of the woods.

When I bought my house it was clear that this was 'green belt' land and I feel strongly that green belt land should remain green belt land for all the reasons I have stated above.

1076 Leeds Road

Dewsbury

WF12 7QS