

DC Admin

From:
Sent: 08 October 2026 10:38
To: Laura Yeadon
Cc: DC Admin
Subject: Planning application number 2026/62/92432/W - Letter of objection

FAO: Case Officer – Laura Yeadon

Dear Ms Yeadon

Prior to stating my reasons for objecting to this planning application, I would like to bring to your attention that the plans of the protected woodland plot submitted by the applicant, are incorrect. A number of the boundaries of the woodland plot are incorrect; the correct boundaries are as shown in application number 2017/62/91286/W. I have checked this information with the Land Registry online as the Land Registry allows individuals to access this information on payment of a fee. There are also some discrepancies in the position/outline of the protected trees in the woodland plot.

I wish to formally object to the above planning application on the following grounds:

1. In Planning application 2016/62/91597/W (which was withdrawn), planning application 2017/62/91286/W (which was refused), and the current application the applicant's answer to 13(a) (the first question in the biodiversity section) indicates that no protected or priority species in the woodland plot would be affected adversely by the development. This is clearly incorrect as native English Bluebells (a protected species) grow everywhere in the protected woodland plot, and these would have been adversely affected by any/all development in this protected woodland including in the current application as the area affected by the relocated fence and gates also contains native English Bluebells (a protected species). My photographic evidence, sent in 3 separate emails, shows the presence of numerous native English Bluebells (a protected species); unfortunately I was only able to capture photographically those English Bluebells close to my garden boundary and not those further away from it as at that time the applicant had not as yet stripped away all the understorey/undergrowth. As this is a protected woodland and not a domestic garden the native English Bluebells are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (including later amendments); this Act states that it is a criminal offence to pick, uproot, dig up or destroy native English Bluebells. Stating that there are no protected species which would be adversely affected on one application could be seen as an error/omission, however this being indicated on all of the applications points to a systematic attempt to mislead the Planning department. What also indicates questionable motives by the applicant, is the fact that the applicant has methodically tried to eliminate/eradicate the native English Bluebells (a protected species) from this woodland plot. The photographic evidence for the presence of the native English Bluebells (a protected species) and the steps the applicant has taken to eliminate/eradicate these Bluebells has been provided in 3 separate emails which are an integral part of my comments on this current application. The photographs of the native English Bluebells growing in the woodland plot were taken in April 2026. Native English Bluebells grow in all of the woodland plot; I was only able to photograph some of the area of Bluebells and the subsequent attempts by the applicant to eliminate/eradicate them. As Kirklees Council oversee the protection of this woodland plot are they responsible for enforcing the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 or are they responsible for reporting this destruction of the native English Bluebells to the appropriate authorities?
2. The current application states the proposal is not an application for a new change of use of the protected woodland to a domestic garden. However, the photographs I have sent in 2 separate emails to support my comments in this point provide clear evidence that the

applicant, , has already started the process of changing the protected woodland to a domestic garden without obtaining planning permission. I specifically draw your attention to the large flagged area he has created (near the group of trees and close to his garden boundary) and the second flagged area he is in the process of creating. The completed flagged area (near the group of trees) is covering the root protection area of a number of these trees, hence compromising the amount of water reaching the roots of these trees. If the flags are allowed to remain in situ they will harm the trees and will most probably result in their death. The applicant, , had these flags delivered on 18 June 2026 and has been creating these flagged areas since that date; I have photographic evidence of the delivery should you require it. activity of flagging large areas of this protected woodland could be the start of its degeneration from woodland to developed land thus potentially leading to the destruction of the visual amenity and habitat benefits of the woodland.

3. The applicant also refers to the section 184 application VX 7576/H&T/SS/RCT749521, the initial approval dated 18 February 2025 and its subsequent revocation/refusal in May 2025. The applicant has omitted to disclose the reason for the subsequent revocation/refusal; he has failed to state that his direct application to the Highways department, circumnavigating the Planning department, for a dropped kerb did not disclose that there was no planning permission in place and that what he was claiming was his garden was in fact protected woodland. I was the individual who informed the Highways department of these facts which led to revocation/refusal.

4. The application states the aim of the work applied for is to provide vehicle clearance and improve Highway safety. There are no issues with vehicle clearance and Highway safety as I have personally witnessed many large vehicle driving in and out of the protected woodland area over the last 2 years without any concerns for the safety of drivers or pedestrians. This also shows that there are no issues with vehicles accessing the woodland plot without a dropped kerb; i.e. a dropped kerb is not required for access. I have video evidence of these vehicles delivering builders waste and flagstones to the protected woodland; unfortunately the videos are too large to email, however the case officer can view them on my phone should they so desire. I would question the need for vehicle access to the protected woodland. What woodland management is proposed that requires this access, including a dropped kerb?

5. The current application is also asking permission to move the fence and the existing gates. Moving the gates and fence will directly impact the root protection areas of at least 2 trees, and could result in causing irreparable damage to these trees and most probably lead to their death. I am aware alongside many other neighbours that the reason the applicant, [redacted] wants to move the gates back 5 metres from the public footpath is to create some parking places. This is not just mine or the neighbours' opinion, it is because the applicant has stated as much to the local residents. His house, 46 The Fairway, has 3 parking places on its drive, however the applicant refuses to park his car on the drive as 2 of the cars have to be parked one behind the other and the cars may need to be moved to allow another member of the family to get their car out. Moving the gates back 5 metres would not allow any vehicle longer than a family car to be parked there without encroaching onto the public footpath. The area of 3.8 metres by 5 metres created by this proposal would comfortably allow at least two domestic/family cars to be parked in this area. The relocated gates and the lowered kerb would allow other vehicles i.e. cars to access the protected woodland in order for that area to be used to park domestic and/or vehicles for sale (which would lead to commercial activity on the site). Both the 2016 and 2017 applications included the creation of 3 parking places in the protected woodland plot. There is record of the applicant trying to use the woodland for commercial vehicles; a neighbour sent in photographic evidence of a vehicle and low loader being parked in the woodland plot every day. Unfortunately, I cannot remember the exact year this occurred, it may have been 2021; I do know that [redacted] was spoken to by an employee of the council so there should be a record of this complaint, most likely it was reported to the Trees Section.
6. The application states there will be no change in soil levels. The applicant is already changing the soil levels in the woodland plot contrary to his statement in the current application that no soil levels would be changed as the photographic evidence I have sent you in separate emails supporting my other points clearly indicates. In addition, the applicant has undertaken extensive work to the understory; he has in fact stripped away the vast majority of the understory as photographic evidence sent to support other points in this letter clearly show. I have further photographic evidence should you require it. As the applicant, [redacted] has cleared the understory/undergrowth it has exposed the numerous saplings he has cut down in the protected woodland plot. I have sent photographic evidence of the cut saplings in a separate email; there are numerous others he has cut which I was unable to photograph. He has cut one mature tree and has covered the remaining stump which is a few feet high with green plastic; photographic evidence sent in a separate email. These activities by the applicant, [redacted] should be thoroughly investigated by the appropriate council department to determine whether he has broken any laws.

This email letter and the 7 additional emails, containing photographic evidence for my comments, together comprise my objection to this application.

I would hope the above reasons for my objection will be noted, and the whole history of the applicant's actions will be taken into consideration when reaching a decision regarding this planning application.