

Clough House
Long Lane
Earlsheaton
WF12 8LQ
09/07/2024

Application reference - 2024/62/91476/E

Dear Mr William Simcock

Please find below the reasons why I object to the above referenced planning application on the land east of Long Lane, Earlsheaton.

I OBJECT to this application for the following reasons:

I appreciate that previously this planning application was approved, however there are some substantive differences in this application that make it even more unsuitable than the previous application.

- 1) This is the 4th time this development has come to the planning committee, twice for actual full planning permission, once to ask for the exclusion of social housing based on the financial impossibility of building on the land and retain their legal obligation to include social/affordable housing. When is the council going to take note of this and come to the same conclusion as everyone else, that this is not an appropriate or effective piece of land to build on, both from a practicality and financial standpoint
- 2) The initial planning application letter is inaccurate. It clearly states there is no contamination on site in the application. This is incorrect, as the previous applications clearly showed there was site contamination that would have to be dealt with
- 3) The new plans include building in a flood zone. On all previous applications the lower 3rd of the site was classified as potential flood risk and they could not build on it. This application however seems to think that global warming has already turned Yorkshire in to the sahara and no flood issues exist. This is clearly wrong and just an attempt to squeeze as many properties on to the land as possible to maximise their profit, at the expense of potential future residents
- 4) The Biodiversity statement shows there is nothing of note there. But it also states clearly that the developers arrived on site a week before they were due to survey the site and cleared it using a tractor and industrial clearing machines. No wonder they found little evidence of a rich and diverse meadow or wildlife, they shredded it all with machines. This calls in to significant doubt the validity of the biodiversity report. This also had the added benefit of knocking down all the Himalayan Balsam and Japanese knotweed that was identified on previous surveys, so is absent from the current survey. For avoidance of doubt, there are both in this field.
- 5) Over development and density – the plan would indicate a density of 46 dwellings per hectare, this is massively over the recommendation or nearly 40% over the minimum density for a given site.
- 6) In the application, they have also ignored every single piece of feedback and planning modification from the previous application – such as the requirement to add a safe surface layer, providing EV charging points and also that Mitchel Laithes farm is now a working farm with livestock and avian stock. This either indicates an inability to submit a truthful application based on known facts from the previous case, or they are being disingenuous and hoping that the planning officers will not look too deeply as it's a re-application and they will not be made to account for those issues so they can make more profit.
- 7) The property bordering the site is an active farm and does have livestock, therefore development will damage the business and cause undue harm to the livestock, and

therefore the noise survey is incorrect and factually wrong. The application is also missing an odour report

- 8) No mention is made in the utility report of the septic tank outflow and soakaway field on the north and east part of the site. This is a shared septic tank system owned and used by both Clough Farm and Clough House. The title deeds for Clough House show that this is shared ownership and no developer has approached the owner of the property in relation to permissions to removing the soakaway field and how they would connect both properties to mains sewerage. Previously the planning officer advised this was a civil matter and not for the planning team. However after receiving legal advice it is "a material factor that **must** be resolved to the satisfaction of the title deeds holder before any planning can be considered" and it is **not a civil matter**. Just for clarity as the owner of Clough House, I do not consent to the developer removing my legal entitlement to continuing to use a septic tank system and the existing drainage / soakaway field. Therefore until this matter is resolved to the owners satisfaction, no planning permission may be granted in breach of those title deeds.

In addition to the serious points of accuracy and truthfulness above, please also consider the following:

Privacy and Oversight

Clough house is an unusual design, dating back to the mid 1800's and as such, all of the windows of the property face south directly overlooking the proposed development site. There are no windows on the rear or side of the property and hence Clough house is not overlooked by any properties at all from Woodburn Avenue or from Mitchell Laithes Farm and has complete privacy to all of the rooms within the property. The garden also has an unusual layout, with the main recreation area being of a stone flagged area directly in front of the main entrance and kitchen. This is also completely private with no properties from Woodburn Avenue or from Mitchell Laithes Farm overlooking the area. This area is also completely hidden from the road by virtue of a 7 foot stone wall running the entire length of the boundary with the road. The nearest property that has any sight of Clough House is 69 Long Lane, which is over 200 meters away.

The other aspect of the garden is a small secluded lawned area to the side and a conservatory. Again this is shielded from view of all local residences by virtue of its location in front of the property and by an 8 foot brick wall to the rear. (please see attached pictures)

The proposed development would provide complete and irrevocable vantage to every window in Clough House from all the opposing windows in plots 1, 2, 3, 4, and the upper windows in plots 11, 12, 13, 14, 15. This invasion of privacy would include the sitting room, dining room and kitchen to the ground floor and all three bedrooms to the first floor and conservatory. The primary garden area in front of the kitchen would be overlooked from all the opposing windows in plots 1, 2, 3, 4 and the secluded lawned area from all the opposing windows in plots 1, 2, 3, 4

This would remove every single piece of privacy and local amenity enjoyed by the residents of Clough House from every single room of the property and all areas of the garden and hence a removal of an amenity which I have the right to quiet and private enjoyment of, in particular valuable green space, privacy and the right to enjoy a quiet and safe residential environment.

This would also mean that every room on plots 1, 2, 3, 4 and the entire garden areas for those plots would be overlooked from Clough House, meaning that the new residents would have significant oversight and zero privacy to their own properties and rear gardens. To mitigate this by using frosted glass or removal of windows would make the proposed properties uninhabitable.

Please see photos below highlighting the issue with overlooking. All the rooms have an unrestricted view of the entire proposed development and the development would have an unrestricted view of the entire frontage of our property and private garden/patio.



Fig 1 – View from kitchen



Fig 2 – View from living room



Fig 3 – View from Living room



Fig 4 – View from all 3 bedrooms



View of Clough House from field boundary

Location of the development is against the national transport policy:

National Transport policy – “When considering transport policy compliance for planning applications, the main thrust of local, regional and national policy is that new development should be conveniently accessible by a range of sustainable transport modes, including public transport, cycling and walking. Address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport; Create places that are safe, secure and attractive – which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, avoid unnecessary street clutter, and respond to local character and design standards”

And the Local Plan Policy LP21 and LP20 – *“Highway safety and access advises that new development should demonstrate that they can accommodate sustainable modes of transport and be accessed effectively and safely by all users. New development will normally be permitted where safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people and where the residual cumulative impacts of the development are not severe.”*

This development does not fit the requirements outlined in the above policies.

There is only a 5 meter stretch of pavement being provided outside of the development, immediately bordered by a stretch of Long Lane with no pavement for over 30 meters (Pedestrian Supporting Statement). The same supporting document also incorrectly shows a pavement bordering on the property of Clough House. This is a small gravel strip that forms part of the land owned by Clough House and is NOT a public pavement. There are several additional sections of Long Lane that have no pavements at all and a significant proportion of the pavement that does exist is less than 3 feet wide and in very poor repair. Also many properties on Long Lane were built before public vehicle ownership was a reality and have no driveways. Therefore there are significant numbers of vehicles parked on the roadside, further restricting the pavements.

Footways and footpaths should be designed so that they provide safety for pedestrians from traffic. The Department for Transport Manual for Streets (2007) suggests that in lightly used streets, the minimum unobstructed width for pedestrians should generally be 2000mm. Inclusive Mobility (2002) advises that ideally the width of the footway should be 2000mm to facilitate two people in wheelchairs to pass each other comfortably. Where this width is not possible, a clear width of 1500mm should be provided, with an absolute clear minimum width of 1000mm in exceptional cases. The phrase ‘clear’ refers to the effective width taking into account permanent obstacles on the footway such as street lamp standards, trees, telegraph poles, bus shelters for example. With the exception of approx. 45m of pavement between the two junctions of Woodburn Avenue and Long Lane, there are no pavements meeting this absolute clear minimum and therefore the whole of Long Lane and access to the development fails in this objective and also contravenes Part III of the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 (DDA).



This will bring pedestrians in to direct conflict with any and all road traffic transiting the lane from all the houses on the proposed development and all the residences on Woodburn Avenue, Long Lane and Scar End Lane. Scar End Lane is an industrial site and has wagons and light trucks arriving at all hours of the day.

Mitchel Laithes farm (bordering the proposed development) is a working farm/business storing cranes and farm machinery and transporting animals which is often transported to and from site on HGVs. This is not only an issue for regular road users, as Long Lane is not suitable for heavy vehicles, but a significant risk for pedestrians and cyclists who use the lane due to the restricted road width and lack of pavements.

In the Supporting Statement it states *“Long Lane is a residential road which provides access to many residential dwellings and estates. It is therefore considered that the existing provision along the carriageway is of an acceptable standard to the surrounding community”* – this cannot be used as a precedent for future developments. The existing developments on Long Lane were built 50-100 years ago, well before private transportation was available or common. With the current levels of traffic and private car ownership, none of the existing developments would have been granted permission with the existing single lane aspect of Long Lane. Stating the surrounding development uses the lane does not make it a suitable lane for current and future use when those developments were all built 50+ years previously.

The lack of pavements and restricted width of pavements on Long Lane will also preclude any disabled/mobility impaired access to the properties without significant risk and conflict with road traffic. Therefore this development is not addressing the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport and does not enable future residents access to Earlsheaton, which is approximately 2km from the application site and therefore walking to the services and facilities on offer is difficult, dangerous and impossible for those with mobility issues.

The council's own policy on *Promoting Sustainable Development* states:

"To ensure plans minimise the need to travel and support the use of sustainable travel modes.

Action plan item 2 -

• *Enable people to make informed travel choices* • *Reduce congestion* • *Improve air quality"*

And

Local Plan Section 3.12

"The council is committed to ensuring that all new developments have safe and convenient access to the West Yorkshire Key Route Network, the main arterial routes and the West Yorkshire Core Bus Network that connect the region."

The development does not meet either of those targets – or the national transport policy - as there is no scope for the development offering a convenient way of accessing public transport or walking, again because of the limited pavements for the entire length of Long Lane bringing all pedestrians in to direct conflict with road users. This has the effect of preventing an inclusive mix of residents and negatively affecting low paid/non drivers/children/disabled residents.

In addition to the conflict with road traffic, the nearest bus stop from the proposed development is 1Km walk. This is outside of the recommended 400m walking distance of the proposed development, the bus stops are located on Town Street approximately 1Km from the development, Therefore the new development will not contribute towards reducing congestion, will not provide any of the new residents a range of travel choices and will not promote the use of public transport. The development will not reduce congestion, with the addition of approximately 30-40 cars utilising the lane and exiting on to Town Street junction each day, due to the lack of convenient and safe access to public transport.

Kirklees council have previously stated that Long Lane is not a road, but a "Lane" and is not suitable for any additional traffic.

Please also see the comments on the rejection of a proposed planning application for 3 dwellings directly next to the proposed development (planning application 87/62/04777/a2) – *"The site does not have a satisfactory link with the adopted highway systems.....it would also create difficulties for service and emergency vehicles."*

The Health Impact assessment provided by ID Planning states: *"The provision of a footpath link as part of the development will build activity into daily life as well as providing a healthy alternative to the private car when accessing recreation spaces, play areas and local services in Earlsheaton."*

Taking all of the above points in to consideration, this is not meeting the overall objectives of the council and the provision of a 5 meter stretch of pavement in front of the development is a 'checkbox exercise' and does not constitute enabling access to local amenities when the remaining 900 meters of footpath are significantly narrow/substandard/missing.

Please also refer to the 5 year long campaign by Kirklees council against Yorkshire Water to have YWA build a bypass road/bridge to direct traffic away from Long Lane. The council spent several years putting pressure on YWA to redirect not only the haulage traffic, but workforce traffic away from Long Lane, as the lane itself is not suitable for any heavy goods or additional traffic and the junction between Headlands Lane and Town Street is not suitable for any additional traffic.

The Council's own assessment of the site in the previous local development plan states as follows:

Local Development plan 2016 Site H307:

Section 10. Secure an effective and safe transport network which encourages people to make use of sustainable and active modes of transport. -- How well connected housing sites are to services, facilities and employment opportunities by sustainable modes of transport will affect the extent to

which residents are able to make use of non-car based modes of transport day to day. *“ In the accessibility heat mapping work that was undertaken for Kirklees Council, the site was not classed as ‘green’ in terms of its access to any of the eight features assessed. Therefore, a significant negative effect is likely overall. ”*

Location of the development against core planning principles:

Local Plan section 2.2

“a social role – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community’s needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; ”

The Highways supporting statement – AMA – page 2 states *“Situating within a 2km walking catchment of the proposed development, the site is within walking distance of Earlsheaton’s local facilities which include; a primary school, health services, post office, convenience stores, areas of employment and areas of leisure.”*

There are no school places available locally - leading to additional out of town travel and congestion from any residents that have children. We have confirmed with Earlsheaton infant school that they are full in all year groups and currently have no space. Orchard primary school is also full. All the local schools are significantly over capacity and therefore out of town commuting for children would be required. There is very limited provision in Earlsheaton and the addition of any new residences would compound this situation.

The Councils own assessment of the site in the previous local development plan states as follows:

Local Development plan 2016 Site H307:

3. *Ensure education facilities are available to all.* The availability of school and college places to serve the growing population will depend in part on whether new places are provided as part of new housing developments, which is unknown at this stage. Effects will also depend on how accessible existing schools and colleges are from residential site options, although there are uncertainties as the effects will depend on there being capacity at those schools and colleges to accommodate new pupils. *“The whole of this site is more than 60 minutes from primary school, secondary school and further education facilities, therefore a significant negative effect is likely.”*

The health impact assessment provided by ID Planning states *“Future residents will be able to access local job opportunities through a range of transport modes, including walking and cycling”* However there are very few local businesses and employment opportunities in the area, being primarily residential, and with the lack of pavement access / conflict with road traffic, this would preclude the future residents of having this opportunity and just lead to greater levels of out commuting and increased traffic.

Section 3.8 of the local plan states:

“There are wide differences in health and well-being across Kirklees. Better quality of life, health and well-being may be achieved by enabling everyone in Kirklees the opportunity to be as physically active as they can be, by providing new and improving existing facilities for sport and recreation and providing better access to good quality open spaces. Good quality open spaces close to where people live provide opportunities for sport, recreation and play, providing enjoyment, encouraging healthy lifestyles and benefiting mental well-being. They are also an essential component of local character providing visual amenity and wildlife value”

Section 8 paragraph 91C *“enable and support healthy lifestyles, especially where this would address identified local health and well-being needs – for example through the provision of safe and*

accessible green infrastructure, sports facilities, local shops, access to healthier food, allotments and layouts that encourage walking and cycling’.

and

Local plan section 4.5.4

“Provide new homes which meet the housing needs of the community offering a range of size, tenure and affordability, support existing communities and access to employment, public transport, shops and services.”

There is a significant lack of local amenities for families of the new development. For example the only public Park is a long distance from the development. This contains the only childrens play area and public area in Earlsheaton. Please also note that there is no public parking at the park or in the vicinity. The only access to the parks facilities is a 1.2km walk from the development, therefore children/residents have to walk up Long Lane with poor/absent paths, coming in to direct conflict with vehicular traffic on the lane and there is no crossing point on Town street to the park. The only crossing point is to walk the opposite way direction to the park and cross at a zebra crossing – adding an additional 300m to the journey. Please also note Town Street is a busy main road and crossing at the zebra crossing is also difficult/hazardous. There are no other open spaces or sports/entertainment centres in Earlsheaton and therefore this planned development is in contravention of these policies.

Doctors/ healthcare centres – There is no local provision for residents in Earlsheaton. The Chickenley medical centre is a 1.9km walk and Mount Pleasant medical centre is a 2km walk from the development.

Dentists – the nearest dental surgery is Empire house dental surgery, which is not taking on any new NHS patients and is a 1.9km walk. No dentists have been found in Dewsbury currently taking on NHS patients.

The Councils own assessment of the site in the previous local development plan states as follows:

Local Development plan 2016 Site H307:

Section 4. Improve the health of local people and ensure that they can access the health and social care they need. *“The whole of this site is more than 60 minutes from a GP and a hospital; therefore a significant negative effect is likely. The site is not within or adjacent to an AQMA.”*

Access to local amenities and services. There are very limited services available in Earlsheaton, with only a corner shop, post office and a few other minor businesses available. Therefore the only option for new residents would be to travel to either Dewsbury or Wakefield (by car because public transport is not safe or convenient) – leading to increased congestion in those town centres:

Councils own assessment of the site in previous local development plan states as follows:

Local Development plan 2016 Site H307:

Section 6. *Retain and enhance access to local services and facilities.* -- The location of housing sites will not directly affect the number or range of services in a particular location (although a large scale housing development could potentially stimulate the provision of new services); however the location of housing sites could affect this objective by influencing people’s ability to access existing services and facilities. *“The whole of this site more than 60 minutes from a local centre and town/district centre. Therefore, a significant negative effect is likely. “*

Local plan Section 4.5.6

“Protect and improve green infrastructure to support health and well-being, giving residents access to good quality open spaces, sport and recreation opportunities, and to support habitats, allowing wildlife to flourish.”

Local Plan LP63: *“New open space advises that new housing developments will be required to provide or contribute towards new open space or the improvement of existing provision in the area”*

The removal of an open green space contradicts this strategic goal in the local plan, and having the site so far removed from any public parks where residents can access sport and recreation facilities contravenes these objectives. There are many brownfield sites available in the area for regeneration and the loss of a valuable green space should not be considered before using up the existing stock of brownfield sites.

The Health Assessment report submitted also states *“The connectivity of the site with local facilities will encourage occupiers to walk, cycle or use public transport, thereby helping to reduce carbon emissions of the residents as a collective.”* please refer to previous statement on the conflict with pedestrians and road traffic, inaccessibility of the site for alternative transport means, lack of local facilities – meaning that this objective cannot be met.

Therefore the development will not only remove valuable green open space from the existing amenities enjoyed by the local community, it will not provide any new facilities or means to access good quality open spaces, or recreation facilities. The nearest footpath to the development is via Mitchel Laithes water treatment plant and this is currently plagued with unsociable behaviour from illegal dirt bikes and 4x4 use. Please refer to the large number of complaints to the police and police bike teams over the past 3 years. This makes those footpaths dangerous to use due to illegal motorised vehicles being used on the paths coming in to direct conflict with walkers, dog walkers, children.

Local plan section 6.11

“The provision of infrastructure is essential to the delivery of development”

There are no plans to provide additional infrastructure either on Long Lane, Headlands Lane or indeed Earlsheaton to enable this development to proceed safely without causing significant negative affects on the local area or wider area. There is also no evidence that this development will contribute to the local economy or create new jobs in the area, other than to provide additional housing for Out Commuters..

Local Plan section 2.2

“An environmental role – contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy.”

As stated previously, there is no convenient or safe access to public transport– therefore everyone will use cars. This is against the councils Climate Action Plan and in contravention of the above local plan aim of moving to a low carbon economy. Putting EV points in the plan does not mitigate the other 30+ cars the site will generate and the increase on congestion, carbon emissions and reduction in air quality. The minimum that should be considered is the installation of EV charging points with solar panels to provide power feedback for those points.

In addition, the council is committed to net zero carbon emissions and in conjunction with the proposed ban on condensing boilers, it should be a minimum that these houses comply with the imminent future condition of using ground source heat pumps and solar panels to power them.

Also the removal of valuable open spaces, green spaces would negatively impact the hunting, foraging and transit patterns for wildlife in the area. The Ecological statement provided does not recognise what was previously surveyed (due to the nuclear bomb effect of their site clearance) that the site is used by a variety of species of bats, hedgehogs and other native wildlife. There is also recognition that the site is part of the UK BAP and the natural hedgerows bordering the sight are of particular local importance and should therefore be retained.

Councils own assessment of the site in previous local development plan states as follows:

Local Development plan 2016 Site H307:

19. Reduce the contribution that the district makes to climate change.

-- The location of residential development will not affect the contribution that the buildings make to climate change, which will be influenced by other factors such as the design of the buildings. However, where residential sites are well-connected by sustainable transport links to employment nodes, services and facilities, levels of car use and the associated greenhouse gas emissions are likely to be lower. *"In the accessibility heat mapping work that was undertaken for Kirklees Council, the site was not classed as 'green' in terms of its access to any of the eight features assessed. Therefore, a significant negative effect is likely overall."*

In addition – the local plan section 6 states:

"Promote development that helps to reduce, adapt and mitigate climate change. Allocating land for new development in locations and ways which reduce greenhouse gas emissions particularly by identifying urban extensions which have the scale and capacity to benefit from low carbon and/or decentralised energy solutions. Avoiding allocating land where possible in the areas at highest risk of flooding. Avoiding the best and most versatile agricultural land where possible"

The development site itself is recognised as a flood risk area, one part of the site is already marked as not to be built on due to flooding, the plots border directly on to the existing flood plane and any changes in the flooding risks for the area with climate change will mean several of the properties will flood. This is shortsighted and complacent, as climate change is real and this will happen. There is also no evidence that the developer has put in appropriate measures to ensure that the development is resilient to the potential impacts of climate change and future increased flooding risk (Local plan section 6.4.M)

The location of this site will contribute to greenhouse gases by virtue of the increased traffic from the residents, as this is not an urban extension with excess capacity in transport, public services or amenities. The inclusion of EV points does not mitigate the overall aim of the council to cut greenhouse emissions by 80%, otherwise there would be an EV point on each dwelling. Also the land itself is of high quality grade 3 agricultural land and has been farmed under Mitchel Laithes ownership and Mr Hardys ownership for many years. This is productive open greenspace with a valuable farming potential. The report from the planning consultation when the land was removed from Greenbelt in May 2016 by Brookes Ecological which stated that the land was grade 3 agricultural land of high value.

The geo-environmental survey provided by Lithos as part of this application states that *"Existing Topsoil is not considered suitable for re-use due to elevated concentrations of arsenic, lead and zinc. Elevated concentrations of inorganic & organic contaminants have been identified in the Ash & Clinker which is also considered potentially combustible"* Therefore the coverage of this contamination will not only incur considerable heavy haulage down an unsuitable highway, but disturb possible contaminants in to Chickenley Beck and move said contaminants to other locations putting the local wildlife at risk.

The same survey also states in section 12.4.3 *"With respect to human health, the proposed end use (residential) is considered sensitive."* And therefore the planning officer should take this in to consideration for future generations that may wish to landscape their gardens, create ponds and other deeper features and the risk this poses to the future residents and local ecology.

The development itself:

The development is out of character in terms of its appearance compared with existing developments in the vicinity

We believe that the proposed development is a direct contravention of the councils local plan section 4.5.8

“Protect and enhance the characteristics of the built, natural and historic environment, and local distinctiveness which contribute to the character of Kirklees”

The buildings on the open space do not respect local context and street pattern or, in particular, the scale and proportions of surrounding buildings, and would be entirely out of the character of the area to the detriment of the local environment. 6 flats is also completely out of character for the area. This would reduce not only the local green space available, but potentially damaging the overall amenities for the community.

National planning framework policy states that good design should contribute positively to making places better for people. Design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, should not be accepted. The over density of the plans go against the local context of all other housing in the area in terms of density, building design and layout. The plot size of the proposed development does not fit in with existing street pattern of the neighbouring community and would therefore negatively impact the area. The lack of convenient public transport or cycling opportunities would create significantly more traffic on the lane to the detriment of the quality of the area.

The council should attempt to balance the demand for housing provision with the need to avoid town cramming. The appropriateness of this proposal has not taken in to consideration the social, environmental and economic characteristics of the site and the local area. The proposed development would significantly alter the fabric of the area and amount to serious ‘cramming’ in what is a low density area. The proposal allows very little space for landscaping and we believe that it would lead to gross over-development of the site.

The proposed development would not result in a benefit in environmental and landscape terms, to the contrary it would lead to the loss of valuable green space. The enjoyment of a view is an important part of the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties, and its loss will therefore have an adverse impact on the residential amenity of all of those properties. Loss of a view from the public viewpoint at Woodburn Avn junction and Long Lane will also have a wider impact on the neighbourhood, and such matters ought to be taken into account.



Therefore I believe taking all of the above items in to account that this **development does not** meet the 3 overarching principles of the NPFF as laid out in paragraph 8

- An Economic objective – to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places [sic] and coordinating the provision of infrastructure;

- A Social objective – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering a well designed and safe built environment with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities health, social and cultural well-being; and

- An Environmental objective – to contribute to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment.

If you wish to view the site and speak to me in person in relation to the many objections I have outlined above , I am more than happy to arrange a meeting with you to discuss this further.

Kindest regards