



which this amount of spraying has had on the near by stream and local eco-system, this is a situation in which the local school is now campaigning to local business's and residents as it has been identified that the local river ecosystem has shown a significant decline within the last few years.

To my understanding the party has previously been asked to return this space to its natural and original state as highlighted above and would argue that they have failed to do so on purpose in order to make it seem that this is grass/scrub land and not urban green space in which it has been for years until involvement.

Given that on the 30/01/2024 that urban green spaces came under fire in UK parliament (<https://committees.parliament.uk/event/20085>) With the main question asked if local authorities and government are 'successfully' protecting and increasing urban green spaces. Would it not stand to question that on this occasion that protection of this urban green space has not happened and by even considering this or further applications would undermine the governments commitments.

Point B

16th April 2020, broke the Wildlife and countryside act 1981 on this land.

This legislation covers four areas:

Wildlife protection, including protection of wild birds, their eggs and nests, protection of other animal and protection of plants

Nature Conservation, Countryside & National Parks

Public Rights of Way

Miscellaneous provisions

gained entry to the land and personally as well instructed associates to cut down a substantial amount of trees, vegetation and hedgerows. As per the date there was still nesting wild birds in which he was informed of before and during the act.

He also broke the Hedgerows Regulations 1997.

These regulations fall under the local authority and are intended to protect important hedgerows from removal. Owners and managers must request permission from their local authority before removing a hedgerow, and permission may not be granted if it supports a diverse range or protected species.

The Planning application states that

"Are there trees or hedges on the proposed development site?

Yes/No" The applicant has stated no, but it is only this way from their own devastation to the land as quoted above.

It states in the application that

"Is a new or altered pedestrian access proposed to or from the public highway?

Yes/No"

the application states no for this question however due to closed fencing it has

obstructed a historical right of way through the land to the cricket field.

Are there any new public rights of way to be provided within or adjacent to the site?

Yes/No

The application also states no for this, so not only have they obstructed a historical right of way on purpose! They have no intention to restore or provide a suitable alternate this is also not in line with The Wildlife and countryside act 1981.

Point C

As can be observed upon any site visit it is visible to see a significant proportion of the road was damaged in April 2020 (in which well established hedgerows once stood) in order to provide a new unapproved access to the land. They have also caused damage to the footpaths to the South of the land in which original entry was sought. This is another law which has been broken in referenced to the Highways Act 1980 (133).

Also increasing housing will increase the amount of local traffic that will utilise this single carriage way road creating further hazards not only on the street but also on the exist towards Wakefield Road.

Regarding these facts and the amount of times this area has been declined of any such planning rights. Surely it stands, to consider this site as a blighted site and thusly not applicable for further planning applications.