



Good evening

I've just received notification from chidswell action group that the same Planning Officers who made the errors resulting in the Heybeck Permission being quashed, have advised they intend to approve Heybeck again and they don't see a need to bring this back to the Strategic Planning Committee.

Hmmm, if the original application was quashed why would a new application not need to follow due process? It's like the planning officers think they can just do as they wish, they were proven wrong last time so they should follow the appropriate process and not try to slide this application in through the back door.

I refer you to the draft (engrossment) Section 106 agreement (Heybeck Lane)'

Seemingly, the new s.106 agreements have revealed the Church Commissioners intend to offset damage caused by the developments by enhancing or creating new habitats in Dum and Dogloitch Wood – both are established ecosystems and unique habitats. Oh and let's not forget the Church Commissioners' Agents decimated two 120+ year old oak trees and felled a suspected bat roost last time they decided to 'improve' Dum Wood! Can they be trusted to offset damage or will they cause even more?

Further I'm not sure you can enhance an ancient woodland and established eco system other than by leaving it alone to do its thing.

In short this new application needs to be brought before the Strategic Planning Committee.

As Dum and Dogloitch Ancient Woodlands are well over 500 years old, are they really appropriate sites to offset damage caused by the proposed development? I think not.

Please consider this objection carefully and don't allow planning officers to as they wish without due process

Faithfully