

From:
To: [DCAdmin](#)
Subject: Objection to Application number 2020/60/92350/E
Date: 20 September 2020 15:02:06

Application number 2020/60/92350/E

This planning application shares a lot of reports with the directly adjacent planning application for 1354 houses and an industrial estate, application number 2020/60/92331/E. Therefore this objection in some parts covers both of these sites. There is also a third adjoining site in planning for a further 280 dwellings to the south of these sites creating one massive linked site.

Transport Infrastructure:

Is there any evidence that efforts to encourage sustainable travel has had even the slightest effect on the number of private car journeys used to commute at peak times? It would make more sense to wait until these measures have been proven to have an effect on the public's behaviour before committing to building dwellings and industrial buildings. It should be noted that access to the M1/M62 corridor is highlighted in section 2.19 of the EIA and undoubtedly will be a major selling point of both the dwellings and the industrial sites. Yet sustainable transport claims are made to suggest commuting by road/car will be discouraged and walking, cycling, public transport will be encouraged.

This increase in traffic is not sustainable. The motorways and local roads are already straining at peak times. Let's be frank people purchasing these dwellings and taking jobs at the industrial site will most likely be driving cars to and from the site. The worst case scenario is that everyone living on site will leave at peak times and those working on site will be arriving at peak times by car. If sustainable transport is genuinely a significant consideration any further approval of developments in the local catchments should at the very least be delayed until it can be proven a significant number of people have changed their behaviour in autumn/winter as well as in spring/summer over a number of years.

There have already been a number of developments in the local area including (at least 175 houses on Amberwood Chase next to the Rugby Ground, an extra 70 houses off Swithenbank Street). Plus others still to be completed around Horbury road and a very large housing development near Pinderfields that I know of. All of which have already added to the strain on local roads and the motorway network. With other planned developments in the immediate area including one in West Ardsley of up to 299 dwellings and 4000 new houses proposed in Dewsbury Ravensthorpe specifically targeting commuters to the City. How many of these will choose to commute by car?

There are already traffic issues at peak time on various roads and the motorway network.

For example the proposed vehicular access point on Haybeck lane leads directly to a junction with the A653, a junction that at peak times regularly backs up significantly. Although there is a separate plan to help with the congestion here it will be worthless if

thousands of extra vehicles are added to the local roads.

Tingley roundabout is already significantly congested at peak times causing traffic to back up along the M62 and effectively be parked on the motorway westbound.

Any slight disturbance to either of the motorways or roads into Wakefield/Leeds regularly causes J40 of the M1 to back up. A worst case increase of several thousand cars at peak time with journeys to the industrial and away from the dwellings will certainly increase the frequency of problems around here. As this includes a road leading past Flushdyke school it would cause a backing up of traffic across the school crossings and an increase in air pollution which must be considered unacceptable.

The roundabout between Owl Lane and the A638 regularly backs up in the evening at peak times. During the morning turning right onto Owl Lane from Gawthorpe already sees backing up of traffic. Increasing this by even a few cars would make it almost impossible for buses to turn and lead to the traffic backing up past the primary school which already has a number of cars parked outside.

Growth cannot be the driving focus; it is simply unsustainable. Further significant developments should be carefully considered until sustainable transport schemes have been proven to decrease traffic at peak times.

Parking:

Having seen the vehicles parked along the sides of the road and impacting the pavements on many new estates it can only be surmised that the number of cars assumed per household by planning departments is far below reality. Fully expect the bin lorries to be seriously impacted by parked vehicles especially if speed bumps/chicanes are added to these roads.

Sustainable transport:

Walking section 6.17 of the EIA states Chidswell lane has good quality footpaths on both sides of the carriageway. This seems to be somewhat misleading as Chidswell lane is nearly 1.5km long and only one third of the length has footpaths. The longer section is only a single carriageway with no footpaths and limited lighting. If this kind of misleading information is being shown here it brings into question what other errors and omissions have been put into the assessments.

Cycling. The suggestion that areas like Dewsbury and Leeds are easily accessible by bicycle and that there are suitable bike lanes is quite frankly ridiculous. The road that leads down to Dewsbury for example is extremely steep and has no cycle lanes. There are also a large number of parked cars on this section before it gets steep making cycling dangerous to even the fittest and most experienced cyclists. The idea that people will start to use bikes rather than cars to travel to these areas is another example of misleading information being present to suggest sustainability and environmental friendliness when no one taking up cycling would realistically consider cycling these roads.

Services:

The Yorkshire water assessment doesn't seem to mention foul water. Has an assessment been done? Do the main sewers have peak capacity for waste?

What effect will these extra dwellings have on such things as water pressure/gas and electrical supplies/ broadband capacity?

Health and wellbeing:

During the recent lockdown even more people than normal have been enjoying the local footpaths. The benefits of getting out into the fresh air and walking along footpaths through fields enjoying nature should not be underestimated. Walking through a congested housing estate or worse an industrial estate will be a significant detriment to the mental health of people in the local region which will have a knock on physical impact.

Environmental:

The green belt land has been recently cynically redesignated after previous applications for development in this area were rejected. The EIA indeed still refers to this land as being within the Green Belt.

currently hunt on these fields. Replacing them with dwellings, roads and industrial sites removes these food sources.

The buffer zones around the woods do not mitigate or consider the impact of a significant number of people being added to the area walking in the woods for recreation, children playing in the woods and an increase in the number of pet cats in the dwellings hunting local wildlife that will be hemmed into the woods. They may help reduce direct damage during the construction phase but as with similar woods near housing and industrial we can fully expect these ancient woodlands to be damaged and filled with litter.

The significant loss of agricultural land should be carefully considered as losing such land decreases the country's ability to feed itself and increases our reliance on foreign imports. With major changes imminent to the way we trade this should be considered of the highest importance.

If the construction goes ahead, particular focus should be kept on any hedgerows and trees that are required to be retained or transplanted so they are not "accidentally" damaged or removed as has become all too frequent in recent times.