

From:
To: [DCAdmin](#)
Subject: Objection to application number 2021/62/92603/E
Date: 02 January 2023 20:23:32

Dear Mr Grayson,

I wish to strongly object to application number 2021/62/92603/E

My name is:

I wish to remain anonymous.

The applicant's own assessment has determined that the potential impact description of dust emissions associated with the construction phase of the proposed development is 'high risk' at the worst affected receptors. Yet they then go on to say there will be little impact on residents! Monitoring and recording of dust levels and monitoring complaints will not stop dust floating around in the atmosphere. No amount of communication planning with stakeholders, or monitoring, will actually stop dust entering our lungs at dangerous levels! Making a complaints log available to the local authority on request will not stop residents and children entering hospital, due to the amount of dust and PM10 entering our lungs during this construction phase (and afterwards when operational)! "Planning site layout so that machinery and dust causing activities are located away from receptors, as far as is possible," will not stop dust and dangerous particles causing health issues to our children at playtime and during PE lessons. "The erection of solid screens or barriers around dusty activities or the site boundary, that are at least as high as any stockpiles on site," will not prevent long term health issues for the people close by, and for our children in their

schools! Dust does not stay within barriers. It filters through doors, windows and into lungs. "Undertaking daily on-site and off-site inspection, where receptors (including roads) are nearby. This should include regular dust soiling checks of surfaces such as street furniture, cars and windowsills within 100m of site boundary, with cleaning to be provided if necessary," - by the time this has to be carried out, the damage is already done! Particles into our lungs causing respiratory illnesses etc., and worsening those already suffering from respiratory illness such as asthma and COPD. To mitigate, is to make less severe. It does not stop dust damaging health! Health effects from particles and fibres from certain materials are immediate, while those from other types of materials may take many years to develop.

Residents face 84 weeks of construction! Eighty four weeks of hell, especially if you have a respiratory illness! 84 weeks where it will be impossible to ventilate our homes! Who on earth is going to be able to open a window, or keep a door open and risk a house and lungs full of dust, and other harmful substances that the applicant just happens to find. Dust will get in no matter what so called "mitigation" the applicant says they'll apply. You are playing with lives, literally. This development should not be anywhere near a residential area. No where near schools and our children. The noise from this construction phase and if the warehouse becomes operational will be totally overwhelming! 24/7, no respite!

The applicant states, "Air Quality Assessment Land to the West of the M62, South of Whitehall Road - Ensure all vehicles switch off engines when stationary - no idling vehicles. Avoid the use of diesel- or petrol-powered generators and use mains electricity or battery powered equipment where practicable." - are they finally acknowledging the fact then, that the diesel and idling engines that will actually come into this huge site in the form of HGVs, are actually harmful to air quality and to residents? If diesel or petrol powered generators and mains electricity or battery powered equipment on site will be harmful, what chance do residents stand of not suffering substantial harm caused by thousands of polluting HGVs & thousands of extra cars! We currently have a field! The operation is planned to be 24/7, 365 days a year. Absolutely no respite! The contrast could not be more stark!

The purpose of mitigation is to identify measures that safeguard the environment and the community affected by the proposal. Mitigation seeks to find the best ways and means of avoiding, minimising and

remedying impacts. This proposal fails NPPF174 (e) & (f) NPPF183, 184, 185 and LP51. The applicant cannot avoid, minimise or remedy the hugely negative impacts of this monstrosity, in relation to air pollution, (let alone noise and light pollution), as it is just too big! A few solar panels, electric charging points and a green roof, in no way remedies the impact on a huge scale, on residents and children from this polluting proposal.

The applicant talks of - “Only use cutting, grinding or sawing equipment fitted, or in conjunction with suitable dust suppression techniques, such as water sprays or local extraction, e.g. suitable local exhaust ventilation systems, using enclosed chutes and conveyors and covered skips, ensuring equipment is readily available on site to clean any dry spillages, and cleaning up spillages as soon as reasonably practicable after the event, using wet cleaning methods. Using Hessian, mulches or trackifiers where it is not possible to re-vegetate or cover with topsoil, as soon as practicable. Ensuring sand and other aggregates are stored in bunded areas and are not allowed to dry out, unless this is required for a particular process, in which case ensure that appropriate additional control measures are in place. Avoiding dry sweeping of large areas. Avoiding bonfires and burning of waste materials. Ensure vehicles entering and leaving sites are covered to prevent escape of materials during transport. Installing hard surfaced haul routes, which are regularly damped down with fixed or mobile sprinkler systems, or mobile water bowsers and regularly cleaned. Ensuring there is an adequate area of hard surfaced road between the wheel wash facility and the site exit, wherever site size and layout permits. Ensuring an adequate water supply on the site for effective dust/particulate matter suppression/mitigation, using non-potable water where possible and appropriate.”

The talk of dust suppression, spillages, cutting, grinding, sawing, soil extraction, dry sweeping, bonfires, burning waste materials, particulate matter suppression is all just terrifying! Especially to someone with a respiratory condition such as asthma, be they an adult or child!

Silica is the common term used for the mineral compound silicon dioxide (SiO_2), and it is one of the most common naturally-occurring elements in existence. Silica comes in two forms: crystalline and noncrystalline. Extended or intensive exposure to RCS (crystalline form) can result in silicosis, which is the hardening and/or scarring of lung tissue.

Common construction materials that contain silica include brick, cement, sand, stone, tile, mortar, grout, drywall and asphalt. Left in solid form, these

materials don't pose a respiratory threat; however, the dust that is created by activities such as mixing, cutting, drilling, blasting, grinding, chipping, etc. is extremely hazardous. It doesn't take much, and exposure over the long term can lead to permanent debilitating conditions and premature death.- This application brings huge amounts of cut and fill. Drilling down. Tons and tons of soil removal. We then have all the dust, braking, revving engines once operational! The pollution from this monstrosity is never ending for residents and children. An 84 week construction phase, then a 24/7 operation, 365 days of the year. Noise, lights, fumes, particulate matter constantly! It literally will be a torturous hell!

One respiratory condition that can come on quickly when exposed to any kind of construction dust, including lower toxicity dusts like gypsum (plasterboard) and marble, is asthma. Workers can wear protective clothing and respirators. What protection do residents and children have? None! As an asthma sufferer, cold weather, fumes, dust, all make my asthma worse! What chance do I stand of being healthy and being able to breathe properly during this 84 week construction phase with the levels of dust and particles? How many times will I need medical attention due to dust and pollution levels outside my home, and due to those dust and pollution levels invading my home? Not only in my home, but in my garden, and whilst walking in and around the village too! What chance of being healthy, and being able to breathe properly do I stand, if Kirklees are negligent in their duty of protecting residents by introducing intense levels of pollution that aren't here now, as currently we just have a field?!

Does Kirklees really want to endanger lives, because it is not an exaggeration to believe that this build, both in construction phase and in operational phase, could do just that! You are literally risking our health, and as such, our lives. This is literally the wrong site for this application.

The applicant states - "Use water-assisted dust sweeper(s) on the access and local roads, to remove, as necessary, any material tracked out of the site. This may require the sweeper being continuously in use. Implement a wheel washing system (with rumble grids to dislodge accumulated dust and mud prior to leaving the site where reasonably practicable)." The Barratt Home development, Wadsworth Gardens has been a constant source of nuisance to residents in Whitechapel Rd, Scholes, Cleckheaton, in that they have continually not followed their construction management plan. Vehicles continually using the wrong roads, travelling through Scholes village and constantly causing a mess with mud on the roads. They had instructions to wash vehicles down before leaving site etc, yet these instructions were not followed. You as a Council are supposed to ensure these conditions are monitored and

followed, yet residents & ward councillors have constantly had to do that for you by reporting the company to you for not following conditions. The roads have been in a mess and dangerous. How on earth do you imagine that as a Department you could possibly monitor and enforce any conditions on this huge site for the Amazon proposal? There will be constant complaints from residents due to the massive disruption to their lives and well-being! There will be a constant failing to follow conditions laid down for the developer, by the developer. You haven't had the manpower to police the planning conditions for Wadsworth Gardens! You're telling me that you have the budgets & manpower to take on this monstrosity!?

So all this hell for the residents of Scholes, Cleckheaton, due to Kirklees ignoring their own local plan, and acceptance that the developable area should be no more than 11 hectares! Wrong application, wrong site! It DOES NOT BELONG HERE! You know it, residents know it, yet the applicant still pursues the notion that - "Following the implementation of the mitigation measures, the impact description of the construction phase is not considered to be significant." In fact according to the applicant, there's nothing in these plans at all for us all to get so stirred up about! The impact of the whole thing, every aspect of it, will be "negligible," according to them! Quite frankly that beggars belief for a building of this size and scale! The truth is that there will be a massive degree of landscape & visual harm arising from this monstrous scheme, reflected in the extent of the ground works required, and in the scale of its massing when set against the site's constraints. All these matters cannot be satisfactorily resolved through mitigations in accordance with your local plan policies and national planning policies. I would draw your attention to a recent appeal dismissal by the Planning Inspectorate of the Newlands warehouse development in Dummer near Basingstoke, (Basingstoke and Dean local Council).

Within Chapter 18 of the "Mitigation and Monitoring Commitments" is the first mention of a "petrol filling station" - Rather worryingly, this is the first mention of a "petrol station" & although it is not unusual to find such facilities within a distribution centre, surely the Planning department would have expected to have seen this detailed within the significant number of plans previously supplied by the applicant? Is this introduction new or was the developer hoping to have this passed without it being spotted? What safety checks and risk have been carried out regarding the positioning of the tanks, especially when considering there is 3 high pressure gas main pipes running through the site? What questions have Kirklees Planning asked of the developer regarding this petrol station and the implications for safety of residents in Whitechapel Road? What risk assessments

and safety checks have Kirklees Planning done with regards to this for resident safety?

Yet again, many of the reports contain conflicting statements & some of the submissions contain inaccuracies and misleading statements.

Images from previous submissions that bear no resemblance to the new submission have been used & there are also reports containing factually incorrect information regarding the local area. Just one example is that the applicant's new traffic plans talk of certain highway works being implemented under a S278 agreement, one of these being, "The improvement of the junction of B3062 with Whitechapel Road to reduce the carriageway and improve the junction for pedestrians."

The B3062 is a road in Bournemouth not Cleckheaton! Is this a genuine error, or has the author tried to use a report from a different application!!? It wouldn't be the first time that roads have been named in the plans of the applicant, that are in a completely different part of the country, so how can any detail in their plans be trusted!? Has due diligence been carried out by every department in Kirklees that has had to do their own reports on the details/ misinformation provided by the applicant? I certainly hope so if this goes to a call in, as the applicants remain lazy with their reports, and appear to have conducted many desk top surveys of the site (as do some departments within Kirklees), and the surrounding areas. The size of this application is huge & it will totally overwhelm residential and visual amenity, and for staff to place so much emphasis on desk top surveys, rather than actually visiting site and the surrounding areas is negligent and disrespectful to the community you all serve.

I support Save Our Spen's representation on this planning application as I share its concerns.

Thank you

Yours sincerely