

From:
To: [Site Allocations Plan](#)
Subject: PDE00792_Leeds Site Allocations Plan
Date: 03 November 2015 17:25:15

Dear Sirs

I wish to comment on the above.

My name is Richard Hellawell, 2 Sandy Lobby, Old Pool Bank, Otley, LS21 1EL

The specific sites I would like to comment on are:

1. Safeguarded Land:

Plan Ref.	SHLAA	Address	Area ha.	Capacity
HG3-5	1095B – 1369	Old Pool Bank (land at)	23.1	540

and

2. Unallocated sites:

Address	Area Ha	Capacity	Green/Brown	Reason
Old Pool Bank, (land at)	1.7	46	Green	Green Belt
Old Pool Bank, (land at)	0.1	3	Brown	Needed to access safeguarded land. Site too small.
Old Pool Bank, (land at)	0.1	2	Brown	Needed to access safeguarded land. Site too small.
Pool Road –SHLAA 4173	12.5	281	Green	Green Belt site
Pool Road – SHLAA 5006	10.9	245	Mixed	Green Belt site

With regard to:

1. Safeguarded Land above

This should never come forward for development rather than being classed as a “Safeguarded site” because:

The Dales landscape would be adversely affected by any development here.

There is insufficient capacity in local schools.

The setting of Pool church within the landscape would be adversely affected.

Part of the land is green belt and this would be adversely affected.

Current highways provision especially at the Dyneley Arms, Pool village, and the A660 and A65 is inadequate as evidenced by the significant congestion especially at peak times.

With regard to:

2. Unallocated sites above

These should never come forward for development rather than being classed as “Unallocated” because:

The Dales landscape would be adversely affected by any development here.

There is insufficient capacity in local schools.

The setting of Pool church within the landscape would be adversely affected.

Part of the land is green belt and this would be adversely affected.

Current highways provision especially at the Dyneley Arms, Pool village, and the A660 and A65 is inadequate as evidenced by the significant congestion especially at peak times.

THE PLAN GENERALLY:

The plan is not sound for the following reasons:

Is it positively prepared? No because it does not take account of infrastructure.

Is it justified? No because the strategic aim should be reuse of brownfield before green field and green belt.

Is it effective? No because any of the sites are not suitable particularly because the infrastructure is not in place and cannot be delivered, e.g. no space for schools, roads already congested.

Is it consistent with national policy? No because the above tests have not been satisfied it cannot be consistent with National Planning Policy Framework.

Instead:

- All brownfield sites in Leeds need to be exhausted before any consideration is given to greenfield sites
- Consideration needs to be given to infrastructure need before any site is approved e.g. school capacity- primary and secondary, determination of future highways demand and how this will be met, ability of local primary health structure to meet anticipated needs of local population.

Furthermore the sites that are proposed to be taken out of the green belt do not meet the Exceptional circumstances or Special Circumstances that need to be in place before this can happen.

Yours faithfully

Richard A Hellowell