

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Site Allocations Plan](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: PDE01942_Leeds Site Allocation Plan consultation comments relating to HG2-1 (3026) New Birks Farm Ings Lane Guiseley.
Date: 12 November 2015 19:28:04
Attachments: [Leeds Site allocation plan consultation response claire Mulholland.doc](#)

To whom it may concern, (full text also attached as a letter)

RE: Response to LDF Publication Draft Consultation, Leeds Site Allocation Plan Section HG-2-1 (3026) New Birks Farm Ings Lane Guiseley.

As a resident of Moorland Crecent, Menston, I very strongly disagree with this site being used for housing and on the basis of the points raised below I think it is very clear that the Leeds Site Allocation Plan is NOT sound.

Firstly, the Plan is not positively prepared. It is clear to all local residents that there are not enough facilities to cope with the number of houses proposed in Aireborough. Doctors and dentists don't have any spare capacity- we moved to the area 5 years ago and have still not managed to find a local dentist which is accepting new patients. It is widely acknowledged that the A65 is extremely congested, even Councillor Richard Lewis acknowledged that on BBC "Look North"! No real assessment has been done on the access to each site or the extra traffic it will create. For each site Leeds have assessed what infrastructure is present now, i.e. how far is the site away from a school, bus stop, a train station, a doctor's surgery, and made no recommendations as to what needs to be put in place to accommodate the new households. Leeds have not done a housing needs survey, so it is possible that developers will plan to build larger houses to create more revenue. The ANDF emerging housing survey suggests the area needs affordable houses for first time buyers and those suitable for couples downsizing.

Leeds Housing target of 70,000 has been described as aspirational. Revised Office of National Statistic figures suggest a much lower figure of 44,500 but LCC will not change their target even though Councillor Gruen admitted on television in a "Made in Leeds" interview that they conceded the figure is nearer 60,000. A lower figure would reduce the amount of Green Belt required to meet the plan.

Secondly, the plan is not justified. The inspector of the Core Strategy asked LCC to do a comprehensive Green Belt review which has NOT been done. Only a view of Green Belt Sites which were selected for development has been completed. LCC have not involved communities in the drawing up of their plans and for each site LCC's sustainability appraisal has not researched how each site will impact on the community and how the new residents will access amenities. There are no transport reviews or ecology reports and the plans contain mistakes due to lack of research and local knowledge.

Thirdly, the Plan is not effective. Leeds and Bradford are not collaborating when planning where housing is planned in terms of roads and traffic congestion. Developments in Menston, Burley and Apperley Bridge will all impact on the A65. Not enough consideration is given to this.

Fourthly, it is clear that overall the plan is not legally compliant and LCC have not fulfilled their duty of Community involvement or their Duty to Cooperate. LCC's document of community involvement was written in 2007 and is therefore now out of date. It does not include their duty to collaborate with forums and parish and town councils designated to draw up neighbourhood plans. The local community does NOT feel we have been consulted fully in the whole site allocation process. Most residents were informed of the 8 week consultation period and the fact that LCC were holding a drop in meeting in Guiseley not by LCC but by a leaflet from a voluntary group. No genuine attempt has been made to engage with the community or to help them understand what is being proposed or how to respond to the consultation.

LCC has not been upfront and transparent in its plans. Nowhere do any documents state that 90% of Aireborough's sites are on Green Belt and documents refer to Green Belt as Greenfield which many consider to be misleading. The term Greenfield suggests that land has already lost its Green Belt Status which it has not.

In the Leeds Local Plan, a comprehensive review of Green Belt should have taken place alongside Bradford as many of Aireborough's sites have boundaries with Bradford. However in the LCC background paper of September 2015, only one meeting is recorded with City of Bradford Council on 6th March and the minutes from this have been requested but not been made available.

In summary, to make the plan sound LCC need to:

Reduce the Leeds housing target from 70,000 to 44,000 (ONS data)

Abide by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Start the plan again with a better methodology e.g. Brownfield first policy

Have an infrastructure plan in place before the site allocations plan.

Build closer to areas with better infrastructure

Build closer to where the bulk of the jobs are, e.g. Central Leeds.

Carry out a comprehensive Green Belt review

Genuinely engage with local communities.

Cooperate fully with Bradford Council

Regarding Site HG-2-1 (3026) in particular, there are also a significant number of important reasons why the proposed development would be damaging to the area and community:

There are 5 official greenbelt purposes: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another; to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. **Four out of the five purposes are fulfilled by site HG-2-1 (3026).**

Development on site HG-2-1 (3026) will result in:

- urban sprawl
- two named settlements of Guiseley and Menston merging along Mire Beck. The Ings defines Guiseley as a settlement separate from Menston, Mire Beck forming the boundary. Development would merge the two, contrary to Green Belt purpose. The fields form a Green Belt Buffer between Guiseley and Menston.
- Mire Beck is susceptible to overflowing into the fields on a regular basis. There have also been instances of sewage pollution in Mire Beck due to the poor state of the sewers in the area. YW have still not solved the problem and have admitted that the present state of the sewer network is struggling to cope.
- loss of a site identified in the Leeds Habitat Network which is home to diverse fauna and the countryside will no longer be safeguarded from encroachment. 19 trees have tree preservation orders and there are mature hedgerows. The trees are defined in the TPOs as adding to landscape value and a feature of intrinsic beauty.
- loss of valuable agricultural land - the site is in active economic use and is Grade 3 agricultural land
- the local infrastructure (as mentioned above) is not sufficient to cater for a major new residential development, particularly given the current A65 congestion issues. Aireborough has already taken its fair share of development since 2000, including the major development on High Royds which is very close by the Ings site, and there is little local employment which means that the majority of residents rely on the already congested transport links to commute to work.

In conclusion, local residents are united in their strong opposition to the Leeds Site Allocation Plan and specifically to development of the Section HG-2-1 (3026) New Birks Farm Ings Lane Guiseley site on the basis that these plans are unsound, unjustified, ineffective and legally unsound. These plans, which will have a negative impact on every aspect of the daily lives of local residents, cannot be allowed to go ahead in their current form.

I would like to be present at the inspector's hearing and to be informed of the submission of the plan for public examination and/or the adoption. I would be grateful for an acknowledgement of this email/letter.

Yours faithfully

Ms Claire Mulholland

8 Moorland Crescent

Menston

Ilkley

Leeds

LS296AF ([REDACTED])