

From:
To: [Site Allocations Plan](#)
Subject: PDE00888_Fwd: Leeds housing Allocation Plan Consultation, Aireborough
Date: 16 November 2015 12:29:12

Dear Sirs

Re Leeds housing Allocation Plan Consultation, Aireborough

I do not consider the Leeds Site Allocation Plan in general to be sound, or justified, and I disagree with the allocation of green field sites for housing in the Aire Valley, an area which has seen significant housing development already in recent years.

Below is my response to the LDF Publication re the draft consultation, re the Leeds Allocation Plan as a whole:

- The plan is not sound – LCC’s sustainability appraisal has obviously not researched any of the sites to the required degree – there is no assessment of how each site will impact the community or how the new residents will access amenities. Equally, there is a lack of sufficient transport reviews or ecology reports. The proposed mitigations stated to alleviate subsequent road congestion on the A65 are out of date and ineffective.
- LCC have not done a green belt review as was asked for by the inspector of the Core Strategy. They have only reviewed green belt sites which were already selected for development.
- The plan is not positively prepared - I do not believe other planned site work in the immediate vicinity, which will need to use the same roads, schools, doctors surgeries and public transport, has been taken into account – Bradford Council currently have development work pending in Menston, for c.300 new houses. This is following the recent development of High Royds (c.350) houses immediately adjacent to Menston – less than 400 yards from the proposed Ings Lane site. Just 2 miles from Rawdon on the A65, Leeds Council (‘North’ site allocations) are also planning a huge development adjacent to Horsforth roundabout, for 777 houses (HG2-41 4240). All of the proposed Aireborough residential sites are on Greenfield sites - all will need to use the A65, which is already massively congested.
- LCC have not involved communities sufficiently in the drawing up of the plans - I do not think adequate consultation has been undertaken (for *any* of the planned sites around the Guiseley and Rawdon area). This is not about Nimbyism – it is about protecting our greenbelt from irreparable damage, in an area that is already massively over-congested with struggling infrastructure.
- Leeds have not done a housing needs survey – so it is possible (and likely) that developers will plan to build larger houses to create more profit. The

ANDF emerging housing survey suggests the area needs affordable houses for first time buyers. The Menston Highroyds housing programme (c350 homes) has not addressed this issue, and neither will the planned Menston development (c.300). This issue was also not addressed by recent housing development on Netherfield road, which joins Ings Lane. Of 75 Bellway homes built, only 14 were 2-bed 'first-home' houses. Equally, the adjacent Redrow site's cheapest property started at £265,000 – certainly not a starter home.

- Leeds Housing target of 70,000 homes has been described as aspirational – Revised ONS figures suggest a much lower figure of 44,500 is more appropriate – but LCC will not change their target even though Councillor Gruen admitted in a television interview that they conceded the figure should be nearer 60,000. A lower figure overall would reduce the burden on the green belt to meet the original plan.

Here are my formal challenges for the specific site plans for Ings Lane:

I believe that the case for this site, for an additional 298 houses in an already highly congested area of the Aire valley, to be unjustified, unsound and has not been properly impact assessed.

- The Ings Lane development will go against 4 of the 5 official purposes of green belt. Development here will result in urban sprawl, and will result in the two named settlements of Guiseley and Menston merging with one another along Mire Beck. Not developing further housing here (in addition to the already developed High Royds location, and the additional 300 houses planned in Menston, less than ½ mile away) will help to safeguard the countryside from encroachment and will mean that Brownfield sites within Leeds will be regenerated by developers – as the easily prepared green belt will not be as easily available to them.
- No real assessment has been done on the access to each site, or the extra traffic it will create. I live on Oxford Road, Guiseley, and note the wording in your impact assessment of Site 3026 (page 43) – “there is a cumulative impact from this development on the A65/ Oxford Road junction”. This statement is made against almost all of the proposed Aireborough allocation sites. And the possible suggested ‘measures’ to mitigate? -“ may take the form of contributions towards more significant measures such as improvements to Horsforth roundabout.”

Horsforth roundabout has already been ‘improved’ this year, by adding multiple traffic lights and traffic filters to try and alleviate what is already a massively over congested road link. It is as ‘improved’ as it is going to get - It hasn’t worked. This will be made even worse by the 777 planned houses allocated for the fields adjacent to the Horsforth roundabout. (HG2-41 4240).

- The roundabout is c.5 miles away from the proposed Ings Lane site - So far away in fact that it's *not even visible* on the Aireborough overview map on page 44. It isn't even in the same planning section and falls under a separate Leeds Council document entitled 'North Site Allocations Plan'. To suggest that improvements to this roundabout would in some way mitigate the building of hundreds of houses on the Aire Valley Greenbelt is staggeringly misjudged.

This is clearly not a proper assessment, and demonstrates a complete lack of understanding of the area and the impact these new sites would have. The suggestion to improve Horsforth roundabout is also massively out of date – it's already been done! And traffic there is still shockingly bad. This proves that these site proposals are unsound.

- Nor are the train lines into Leeds or Bradford a solution to the problem – the trains are excessively overcrowded already and new stations are opening at Apperley Bridge and Kirkstall Forge with no additional services planned.
- In the Leeds local plan, a comprehensive review of green belt should have taken place alongside Bradford – there is no evidence this has taken place. Only one meeting with Bradford city council is recorded in their September background paper.
- It is not realistic or justified to attempt to allocate 3% of the entire Leeds district wide target total to an area that is primarily greenbelt (Aireborough) – the 3 small towns of Rawdon, Guiseley and Yeadon - when only 6% of the district wide target has been allocated for the entire 'North' Leeds area, comprising the much larger areas of Chapel Allerton, Headingley, Holt Park, Horsforth, Kirkstall, Meanwood, Moor Allerton, Oakwood, Harehills, Hollins Park, Butcher Hill, Weetwood, parts of Moortown and Roundhay.

How LCC can make the plan sound:

- Reduce the Leeds housing target from 70,000 to 44,000 (as per ONS analysis)
- Abide by the National Planning Policy Framework
- **Start the plan again with more focus on developing available brownfield sites first**
- Have a more detailed infrastructure plan in place before the site allocations are drawn up
- Build closer to areas with better, less congested, infrastructure and transport links
- Engage properly with local communities
- Cooperate with other councils, such as Bradford, to ensure that areas

adjacent to one another are not over-allocated for development (as is the case with the Ings Lane site)

- Council members visit these sites and the area to understand the impact this additional housing would have on the already congested existing transport links, schools, doctors and other essential services.

I would like acknowledgement of my response and to be informed of the submission of the plan for public examination and/ or the adoption.

Best regards

Helen Shaw