

Sent: 25 September 2026 13:13
To: DC Admin
Subject: Planning Objection 2025/62/93355/E Land Off Woodward Court

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good afternoon,

RE: Planning Application Objection 2025/62/93355/E Land Off Woodward Court

I am writing to submit additional material planning grounds in support of my objection to the above planning application.

1. Highway Safety and Access (Hepworth Lane / Hepworth Close)

I would like to reiterate my serious concerns regarding the proposed site exit onto Hepworth Lane, specifically regarding safety for residents exiting Hepworth Close. Having reviewed the applicant's Traffic Survey, I believe it fails to adequately evaluate the severe sightline restrictions and safety risks at the junction of Hepworth Close and Hepworth Lane.



- **Severe Sightline Restrictions:** As shown in **Photo 1** (view from my vehicle exiting Hepworth Close onto Hepworth Lane), visibility of the proposed exit is completely obscured. Vehicles turning right out of the proposed exit create a direct head-on collision risk with vehicles exiting Hepworth Close. Furthermore, there is no visibility of vehicles entering Hepworth Lane this has resulting in several near misses



- **Narrow Pinch-Points and Lack of Passing Provision:** As shown in **Photo 2** (view entering Hepworth Lane from Flash Lane), the carriageway is exceptionally narrow and only wide enough for single-file traffic, with no passing places available past Hepworth Drive. Drivers turning out of the proposed access cannot see oncoming vehicles, creating an immediate highway conflict point with nowhere for vehicles to safely yield or pass. The proposed exit is not even visible so there is no way of knowing if vehicles are exiting the proposed exit and if they are you are going to meet them head on.
- **Cumulative Impact:** Adding approximately 150 additional vehicle movements—combined with existing peak school run traffic using Hepworth Lane as a cut-through—poses an **unacceptable impact on highway safety**.
- **Planning Policy Reference:** Under **Paragraph 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**, development should be prevented or refused on highways grounds where there would be an *unacceptable impact on highway safety*. The proposed access also fails to comply with visibility splay and safe design standards set out in **Manual for Streets (MfS)**.

2. Protected Species and Biodiversity Impact (Barn Owls)

Over the last few months, there have been frequent, documented sightings of **Barn Owls** foraging and roosting across the proposed development site.

- **Statutory Legislation:** Barn Owls are a **Schedule 1 protected species** under the **Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended)**, making it an offence to intentionally or recklessly disturb them or destroy their nest/roost sites.
- **Biodiversity Duty:** Under **Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006** and **Chapter 15 of the NPPF**, the Local Planning Authority has a statutory duty to conserve and enhance biodiversity. Granting permission without an up-to-date, independent ecological survey specifically addressing Barn Owl foraging habitat and roosting sites violates this requirement.

3. Land Instability and Coal Authority Requirements

The Coal Authority, in its response dated 14th January, explicitly stated:

"Should soil stripping of the additional development areas have not been carried out, we consider these further investigations should be undertaken prior to the determination of the application to ensure that any unrecorded mine entries present are identified and in order to inform the detailed layout of development under consideration by the LPA."

As an immediate resident adjacent to the site, I observed that recent soil stripping was restricted strictly to the perimeter and the bottom of the field, leaving substantial portions of the proposed site unexamined.

- **Ground Stability Policy:** In accordance with **Paragraphs 189 and 190 of the NPPF** and National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) on Land Stability, the planning authority must ensure that the site is safe and suitable for its proposed use. Determining this application prior to

carrying out comprehensive, full-site intrusive investigations and complete soil stripping across the entire footprint directly conflicts with the Coal Authority's expert advice and statutory safety policy.

For the reasons outlined above, I urge the Planning Committee / Local Planning Authority to refuse this application or require full further investigation before any decision is made.

Kind regards,