

From:
To: [Site Allocations Plan](#)
Subject: PDE02142_Formal Objection to development of Greenbelt sites HG2-5 & HG2-6
Date: 11 November 2015 00:32:25

LDF Publication Draft Consultation,
Forward Planning &
Implementation,
Leonardo Building,
2 Rossington Street,
Leeds
LS2 8HD

Guy Barker
60 Silverdale Drive
Guiseley
Leeds
LS20 8BE

11th November 2015

RE: LSAP & AVLAAP - FORMAL OBJECTIONS MADE DURING PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Dear Sir / Madam,

I wish to make you aware of a number of strong objections that I have with regard to the proposed development of greenbelt and green field sites.

HG2-5 (sites 2163a / 1180a /1311a)
HG2-6 (1113).

As a local resident living close to the sites of proposed development, I am of the view that the proposed developments on greenbelt protected land will have a serious negative impact on my standard of living and should be excluded from the plans. My specific objections are as follows:

Inconsistent with National Planning Policy Framework:

LACK OF INFRASTRUCTURE: NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet no provision has been made to increase local public transport capacity, specifically trains into Leeds – the target work location. These trains at rush hour currently compete with those in the South-East of England for overcrowding.

Inconsistent with Leeds Development Plan Policies:

DENIAL OF HOUSING TARGET RE-ASSESSMENT NEED: The current housing target which drives the need to develop on the greenbelt is flawed and needs to be changed. It is based on outdated, over inflated housing targets which require that over 66,000 new properties are still needed. This urgently needs to be brought in line to the latest 2014 figures (from the Office of National Statistics), which show a need of only 46,000 new homes. It has also recently been revealed that there are currently 5,552 long-term empty properties in Leeds, which could be targeted as a priority by the Local Authority to bring back into use by the private owners.

Negative Impact on Highway Safety and Traffic:

The Coach Road fields are currently allocated for 83 houses plus a school. How can a school be placed on a site with such poor access? 300 children plus ~40 staff and the whole of Silverdale would be gridlocked. This would be a significant road safety issue in a residential area, notwithstanding blocked drive access to emergency vehicles by school traffic at least twice a day. This daily gridlock would propagate out to the A65, one of the most congested and dangerous roads in Leeds.

Lack of Conservation of the Natural Environment:

Historic England (formerly English Heritage) have commented on both these sites and found them 'unsound'. Quoting from their assessment document ref HD/P5114/04 sent to you on 21st October 2015...

The Allocation of a site for development in the Local Plan is, as Paragraph 2.52 of Section 2 of the Plan makes clear, "establishing that the site is suitable for that use" and, therefore, that the principle of development in those particular locations is acceptable. However, in the case - 2 - of this Local Plan, there has been absolutely no evaluation of what impact the

loss of these currently-open areas and their subsequent development might have upon those heritage assets.

They go on to recommend...

Before allocating this area, therefore, there needs to be an assessment of the contribution which this currently-undeveloped area makes to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, and what effect the loss of this site and its subsequent development might have upon the elements which contributes to its significance. This site should not be allocated unless there are clear public benefits that outweigh the harm (as is required by NPPF, Paragraph 133 or 134).

Lack of Co-operation with Neighbouring Councils

NO COHERENT REGIONAL CO-ORDINATION: Bradford, Halifax, Wakefield and Keighley contain huge swathes of post industrial, derelict brown field sites that lay undeveloped and are ideally suited for low cost starter homes that are actually in the most demand, and should be developed in preference to the Greenbelt sites of Leeds.

Unsuitability of Consultation Process

I. WEB SITE OBSTRUCTIVENESS: The council's consultation feedback website does not allow for the objections of greenbelt development across Leeds. The method is divisive in that it forces the user to focus only on sites on an individual field by field basis, making the commenting of objections to all proposed sites an impossible task.

II. LIMITING ACCESS TO INFORMATION: There is nowhere in the council's published documentation that provides a clear list of greenbelt sites which are nominated for development. They are hidden in isolation amongst the wide array of other sites, making them inaccessible to the public.

III. LACK OF PUBLIC AWARENESS: Less than 25 members of the public attended the councils' largest scale opening exhibition held in the Grand Hall of the Civic Centre. There have been no visible letters sent to households across Leeds, no TV campaign, no radio campaign, no social media, no newsletters via schools, nothing. As a result, the vast majority of the people of Leeds have not been given the opportunity to comment on issues that affect them.

On these and other grounds, I sincerely hope that you are able to act on my behalf and reject the progression of these greenbelt sites within the development proposals. Please keep me informed of opportunities to present my objections to the planning panel, the public examinations, the submission of the plans and potential outcome of the review.

Yours faithfully,

Guy H Barker