From:

To: <u>Site Allocations Plan</u>

Subject: PDE01314 Comments on the Leeds Site Allocation Plan

Date: 15 November 2015 17:07:14

Name and Address

David Welburn, 192 Tinshill Road, Cookridge, LEEDS. LS16 7LE.

E-mail:

1. I do not agree to the following sites being allocated for housing. The following comments apply to all of the listed sites.

1.1 Site Addresses

HG2-12 - Woodlands Drive, Rawdon

HG2-41 - South of A65 from Horsforth & Rawdon RA to crematorium

HG2-42 - Broadway and Calverley Lane, Horsforth

HG2-43 - Horsforth Campus

These are green belt sites and I do not believe there are any Exceptional Circumstances (as defined in paragraph 83 of the National Planning Policy Framework - NPPF) that would justify any of the land being taken out of Green Belt Status.

Further housing (particularly the cumulative volumes involved across all of these sites) will add to the congestion on the A65 / A6120 which currently struggle to cope with existing traffic. There are few shops and amenities in this immediate area so potential residents will tend to drive as a result. The capacity of the local bus services will also have to be increased and will be impacted and delayed by the increased volumes of traffic. Local Rail services will also have to provide for increased numbers.

Local schools do not have the capacity for an increase in numbers therefore children will have to travel outside the immediate area assuming they can be accommodated elsewhere. Local medical and dental practices will also fail to cope with such a large increase in the number of residents.

2. Sites Not Identified For Housing

I agree that the following Unallocated Sites should remain unallocated and not be assigned for housing.

Site Area Capacity Type Reason (Ha)

Cookridge Lane 1.6 50 Green Belt Green Belt Site

Land North of Pinfold Lane 5.6 148 Green Belt Green Belt Site

Land South of Pinfold Lane 6.9 181 Green Belt Green Belt Site

Cookridge Golf Club (South) 22.4 578 Mixed Green Belt Site

Cookridge Golf Club (North) 36.7 0 Mixed Green Belt Site

3. Comments on the Soundness of the Plan.

3.1 Positively Prepared.

I question whether the required Gross Target of 74,000 is accurate as people commute into cities and the plan assumes that all of them need housing in the Leeds SAP. The actual target will therefore be less than this figure and the plan should reflect this.

The plan also does not appear to take account of the change in infrastructure that would be needed to fulfil the plan.

3.2 Justified.

A large number of the sites are existing Green Belt areas and the plan should attempt to use existing Brownfield sites first, followed by Green Field sites and only in Exceptional Circumstances should Green Belt sites be considered and justified.

3.3 Effective.

For many of the sites the existing infrastructure (schools, medical, roads, transport etc.) would not be able to cope with the increase in housing capacity and the plan does not show how the infrastructure changes would be delivered.

3.4. Consistency With National Policy

As the plan does not meet all of the policies of the NPPF (issues as described above) it cannot be consistent.

3.5 Changes to the Plan.

To make the plan more acceptable the Council needs to prioritise the use of Brownfield sites and exhaust these before consideration is given to Green Field and Green Belt sites.

Before any site gets approval the Council needs to ensure that the associated

infrastructure can support the increase in housing capacity. This includes roads, transport plus school and health capacities.

4. Public Enquiry.

I would like to nominate Councillor Barry Anderson to represent me at the associated Public Enquiry.

Signed: David Welburn 15/11/2015