

**From:**  
**To:** [DCAdmin](#)  
**Date:** 05 November 2022 16:01:34

---

Good Day,

I would like to state my objection to the following planning applications – in the strongest possible terms.

Reference Numbers:

2020/92350 & 2020/92331

Please see below for my reasons for objecting.

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.

Permanent displacement of endangered Skylark & Yellow Hammer which breed on the land in large numbers. The Ecological Impact Assessment states: "with a development site of this scale, some impacts remain significant, and are very hard to mitigate". Years out-of-date Ecological Surveys which have been 'updated' by one single walk-over by an Ecologist (employed by Land Owner) in October 2022 after a drought.

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.

Unrecorded protected species have been evidenced on site by local community. These species have additional protection in the planning process but are not considered if they are not in the Ecological Surveys. We have evidenced Schedule 1 species: Kingfisher, Red Kite and Barn Owl. The Land Owner has dismissed our evidence to say the species are only foraging on site and not resident. Have you ever seen these species on site? 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'. We have over 9,000 verified recordings of bat calls in and around the 2 Ancient Woodlands. I particularly object to the disturbance and disregard for the Bat habitat. 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

Loss of local amenity with positive benefits on mental health

Loss of green lung that separates Leeds, Wakefield & Kirklees Impact on Kirklees Wildlife Habitat Network / Local Wildlife sites. This is an important link in the wider habitat

network.

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.

Objections from CPRE & the Woodland Trust were redacted by the Planning Department, to remove details of who they were from when published on the Planning Portal.

I do not feel that our voices are being listened too and it appears that only money counts!

Yours sincerely