Dear Sir / Madam,

Please find below my objection to the proposed development:

Planning application reference 2020/92331 Land east of Leeds Road, Chidswell & 2020/92350 Heybeck Lane

Objections to this development

1. **Green field site development** - Although this site isn't technically green field this is only because an area exactly the same size and shape as this combined development was removed from greenfield in February 2019 as part of the Kirklees Local Plan.
2. **Health Impact –** The health impact assessment states that Kirklees currently has 1 GP to every 2,270 patients which is significantly above the national average of 1:1742. These additional households will only exacerbate the current issue. The assessment also states that the life expectancy for residents is lower than the national average and the adult physical activity levels were worse than the England average. This would suggest that the area is already over stressed. The capacity for local hospitals, accident and emergency, etc doesn't appear to have been mentioned.
4. **Emergency services –** No mention appears to be made for increased fire or police numbers.
5. **Unrealistic Travel Plan –**The residential travel plan states that people are likely to walk / cycle to places of work as Dewsbury is within the preferred maximum distance of 2000m. This ignores that the acceptable distance is 1000m for a commute. It also more importantly ignores the local hills and traffic on the route especially at rush hour. As a reasonably fit occasional cyclist I wouldn`t be willing to cycle to Dewsbury at rush hour and suggest that anyone who thinks this is a reasonable form of transport for this route to try it for themselves. Similarly the travel plan suggests the bus services are acceptable. Considering many people will be travelling to Leeds or Wakefield the bus takes approximately an hour, so in order to get to Leeds before 9am you need to catch a 7:30am bus or set off in a car at 8:15am, I know what most people will do. Catching buses only works when they are more frequent and direct i.e. close to town centres or well serviced routes. Therefore I believe that more car journeys should be added to the traffic plan assessment.
6. **Lack of parking –** Kirklees guidance says there should be 2 parking spaces for a 2-3 bed dwelling, 3 for a 4 bed plus 1 visitor space per 4 dwellings. On the plans I can see the two spaces per dwelling but only about 20 visitors spots with no indication as to where the other visitors will park. I presume this will be on the central access road as all others seem too narrow to allow parking and fire truck access. It also appears that several of the 4 bed Hemsworth do not have adequate parking for 3 cars for example plots 141&142 amongst others.
7. **Bad access –** there are 32 of the houses that can only exit onto Windsor Road. This road is already frequently full of parked cars so visibility will be poor. There are 34 dwellings whose only access is onto Chidswell Lane, this is a single track road with limited visibility and only partial footway which is a regular walking route for a large number of the community. This number of accesses with some drives backing straight onto Chidswell Lane will make it an unsafe place for people to access.

8. **Inadequate local roads-** The new M62 J28 Assessment states in scenario 2 that the local road network and motorway junctions will already be over capacity once all the construction that has already been given planning permission has been completed before even considering these new developments. This report also doesn't seem to consider at all the M1 junction 40 which already can have significant delays from people travelling to Leeds or Wakefield. The report seems to conclude that this overcapacity has already been agreed so is ok and to consider as the base level then adds extra delays on top of this. The only scenario that appears to be slightly better than scenario 2 involves alterations to the junctions. This still leaves the road over capacity and worse than it currently is when all the already agreed development is taken into account. It also seems to state that the delays are acceptable without considering that many people will be delayed at several of these pinch points on a journey making a cumulative terrible journey.
10. **Services –** There appears to be no mention made of supplies of water, gas, electric unless these were previously design for way over the capacity required for the existing housing in the area how will these extra developments supply the increased demand for these resources?
11. **Possible inadequate drainage -** The Flood Risk Assessment produced indicates an allowance of 30% climate change, however Kirklees recently declared an emergency on climate change due to the flooding that took place earlier this year. This changed the LLFA guidance to 40% climate change allowance. I would therefore requested that the site looks to cater for/ ensure no additional flood risk at the 100yr + 40% CC event. Finally there doesn't appear to be a drainage layout, I would ask where/ how the 2944m³ (at the 100yr + 30% CC event) are been stored within the scheme.
12. **Local Habitats** The new proposed developments remove large areas of green space and closely abut two areas of woodland habitats and numerous becks. Although a theoretical buffer is to be added next to the woodland this is unlikely to actually protect the woodland. Anyone who has ever visited a woodland next to a significant residential or industrial development will be aware of the significant litter, small campfires and disturbance to wildlife by pets and people. Although the ecological report seems to gloss over it there is currently diverse wildlife habitats here that once their gone they can't be got back.

Summary

I believe that this development and especially the combined extended development isn't in keeping with the local area and will considerably over stress the local services and infrastructure. We request that when the application is reviewed that this is taken into account as well as the shear extent of local objections to these developments.

Kind Regards