

About the application

Application number: 2020/92350	
What is the application for?:	Outline application for residential development (Use Class C3) of up to 181 dwel
Address of the site or building:	Land south of, Heybeck Lane, Chidswell, Shaw Cross, Dewsbury
Postcode:	

User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	Yes

Objection to Application 2020/92350 on the following grounds:

1. The development will result in the junction of Heybeck Lane, Leeds Road and Soothill Lane being over capacity. The traffic surveys carried out for the development of 366 houses on land off Soothill Lane shows the junction to be over capacity, yet the surveys provided by the applicant appear to show differently. The application should be rejected on the basis that the traffic surveys for the junction showing it as over capacity have been accepted by the planning authority, the surveys submitted for the Heybeck development are inconsistent and contradict previously accepted surveys.

2. The development will cause harm to the Green Belt. An adjacent development for the conversion of a utilities building into a dwelling was recently rejected due to the harm it would cause on the neighboring green belt land - a scaled back application was later approved as the harm could be mitigated by reducing the size of the development. If the development of a single dwelling on a brownfield site was deemed by the planning authority to be harmful to the greenbelt, then it must be the case that the adjacent application for 181 houses on land adjacent to the greenbelt must also be too harmful and consistently scaled back. The NPPF states that when considering an application, substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt. Therefore, the application should be rejected due to the level of harm that it would cause to the greenbelt. This refusal would be in line with the other recent aforementioned planning decision.

3. The development will result in the permanent loss of agricultural land. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that the economic and other benefits of agricultural land are considered and that development should occur on areas of poorer quality land instead of higher quality land. The applicant has not supplied adequate evidence of the quality of the land and therefore a robust assessment of whether the NPPF is being followed in this respect cannot be made. The application should be refused on the basis that the necessary evidence of the quality of the land has not been provided as required.

4. The development will result in the permanent displacement of yellow hammer and skylarks which are considered endangered species. The ecological survey evidence provided by the applicant is not robust and does not stand up to scrutiny, having been conducted and updated in non-representative conditions (a drought). Government guidance requires developers to submit enough information for the full consideration of the effect on protected species and their habitats. The application should be refused as the necessary information has not been adequately provided.

5. The development claims achievable biodiversity net gain increases. Previous verified biodiversity net gain reports showed a 14% net loss in biodiversity, yet with no nominal changes in the application, an updated report which has not been verified or substantiated claims a net biodiversity gain from the development. The applicant has not provided the necessary evidence as to how the previous net biodiversity deficit has changed so radically. The application should be refused on the basis of the net gain biodiversity report not being fit for purpose.

Please redact my address as it has no bearing on the grounds for objection.