

From:
To: [Site Allocations Plan](#)
Subject: PDE01792_Leeds Site Allocations Plan - response form submission - HG2-17
Date: 13 November 2015 14:46:59

Part 1 - Your details

First name: **Anthony**

Last name: **Cook**

Address: **63 Breary Lane East, Bramhope, Leeds**

Post code: **LS16 9EU**

Part 2 - What comment do you wish to make?

2.1 Which Plan do your comments relate to?

Leeds Site Allocations Plan: **YES**

2.2 Which section of the Plan do your comments relate to?

a. A specific site/designation in the Plan: **HG2-17 (1080 & 3367A)**

Do you agree with the proposed use of this site: **NO**

Please tick all the themes you wish to comment on:

Ecology/Landscape/Trees(s): **YES**

Local services/facilities: **YES**

Schools: **YES**

Conservation/Heritage: **NO**

Loss of Greenbelt: **YES**

Highways/transport: **YES**

Site Boundary: **NO**

Other: **NO**

Part 3 – Is the Plan sound?

3.1 Do you consider the plan to be sound?: **NO**

3.2 Which test of soundness are your comments about?: **JUSTIFIED**

3.3 Please set out why you think the Plan is sound / unsound

I wish to comment on the HG2-17 (1080_3367A) development in Bramhope on the grounds of (lack of) sustainable development and environment/conservation issues. The development is far too large for the village of Bramhope for the following reasons:

<!--[if !supportLists]-->1. <!--[endif]-->**Lack of sustainable development:**

The proposed site and housing allocation will cause a disproportionate increase in the size of Bramhope village (around 20%) which will put severe strain on the local amenities and infrastructure. In particular the current school and health centre cannot support the proposed increase in village size (likely 1000+ additional people). In particular the Bramhope health centre has inadequate parking and an appointment waiting list of over two weeks. The Bramhope village school is already oversubscribed.

The proposed site must support the guaranteed provision of a new school with *adequate parking* and an additional health centre again with *adequate parking*. These should NOT be built on the greenbelt portion of the site (see below).

The village is short of smaller sized housing for retirees to downsize into. If any development does go ahead this factor must be considered as part of village sustainability. Personally I will need to downsize within the next 8 years and I don't want to be forced to move away from Bramhope due to a lack of suitable smaller housing.

I would support a smaller scale development that could be supported by adequate expansion of village infrastructure. Currently the housing allocation on this site is just far too large, effectively creating a small town, with inadequate amenities, divided centrally by the very busy A660.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->2. <!--[endif]-->**Highways congestion:**

The introduction of 380+ new houses adjacent to the A660 will put additional pressure on a road that gets severely congested in the rush hour. The A660 is currently a severely congested road in Leeds with no improvement over the last 8 years. I refer to:

A65 AND A660 CORRIDORS – TRAFFIC FLOWS AND VEHICLE SPEEDS (2007)

<http://democracy.leeds.gov.uk/documents/s5398/A65%20and%20A660%20Corridors%20-%20Traffic%20Flows%20and%20Vehicle%20Speeds.pdf>

It is widely acknowledged that the Leeds-Bradford area has the worse road congestion in the UK

<http://www.yorkshireeveningpost.co.uk/news/latest-news/top-stories/worst-queues-in-uk-on-leeds-roads-1-4728768>

http://www.thetelegraphandargus.co.uk/news/local/localbrad/9809113.Roads_in_Bradford_and_Leeds_most_congested_in_England/

The addition of 380+ homes at the HG2-17 site with sole access to the A660 can only contribute to making the current bad situation worse. The addition of other new housing (Adel) and proposed new housing (Boddington Hall, Otley etc.) on the A660 corridor would also contribute to worsening the existing very poor situation.

Personally I often drive to work after 9:30 because of this congestion which causes excessively slow traffic all the way into Headingley at peak hours. In non-rush hour periods my journey time is 20 minutes but regularly takes 3 to 4 times this during peak times (so I spend around 6 full days a year stuck in traffic jams).

<!--[if !supportLineBreakNewLine]-->

<!--[endif]-->

<!--[if !supportLists]-->3. <!--[endif]-->**Brownfield vs. Greenfield development:**

I *vigorously* support a "Brownfield site first" policy with new housing development prioritised for existing brownfield sites of which Leeds has a large number of existing sites that can be built on.

<http://www.itv.com/news/calendar/update/2015-07-23/automatic-planning-permission-for-brown-field-sites/>

The total allocation of sites within Bramhope (HG2-15, HG-16, HG-17) are disproportionate to this policy, being about a 70% a mixture of green-field and green-belt land (the HG2-17 site is 100% greenfield/greenbelt).

<!--[if !supportLineBreakNewLine]-->
<!--[endif]-->

<!--[if !supportLists]-->4. <!--[endif]-->**Maintain Greenbelt status:**

The site includes green belt land (3367A). I object to any future proposal to reassign this land to a non-greenbelt category such as 'greenfield'. Greenbelt land that is currently in agricultural use should remain in agricultural use (it is currently used to grow silage). Local food security is an issue that must be taken seriously. Any encroachment into greenbelt land must be avoided as that land is then lost forever for agricultural use.

<!--[if !supportLineBreakNewLine]-->
<!--[endif]-->

<!--[if !supportLists]-->5. <!--[endif]-->**Conservation:**

The HG-17 site is adjacent to Spring Wood which is a relatively rare and pristine "thick carpet" bluebell wood. The abutment of any housing development to this wood will put the ecology of the site at risk. There should be substantial ecology buffer set aside between the wood and any housing to preserve the wood in its existing state.

The northern edge of the site is adjacent to a listed building on Breary Lane East. Also the site overlaps the village conservation area along the western portion of the north boundary. To maintain the setting of the listed building and the dew pond portion of the conservation area, a substantial buffer zone is required.

<!--[if !supportLineBreakNewLine]-->
<!--[endif]-->

On these grounds I object *very strongly* to the HG2-17 plan in its current form. I'm not adverse to housing development in Bramhope but strongly believe that developments should be small scale and spread around all of the arterial roads to share out the inevitable increasing traffic congestion.

3.4 Please set out what changes you consider necessary to make the plan sound.

1. Decrease the housing allocation to sustainable levels for Bramhope taking into consideration the highways, health centres and schools issues.
2. Ensure an additional health centre is in the plan - with adequate parking - and a school if the final house allocation warrants it.
3. Conserve the Greenbelt portions (3367A). Maintain its use for agricultural purposes.
4. Add sufficient buffer zones for Spring Wood and the Village Conservation Area/Listed buildings settings.

Part 4 – Is the Plan legally compliant?

4.1 Do you consider the Plan to be legally compliant?: **Don't Know**

Part 5 – Take part in the public examination

5.1 Would you like to take part in the forthcoming Public Examination?: **YES**

Part 6 – Future updates

6.1 Would you like to be notified of any of the following?

The submission of the Plans(s) for Public Examination: **YES**

The adoption of the Plan(s): **YES**

Signed: Anthony P. Cook Date: 13/11/2015