

From: [James Jackson](#)
To: [Site Allocations Plan](#); [CDV Aire Valley Leeds AAP](#)
Subject: PDE02682_Re: Site Reference HG-10 (1221) Gill Yeadon
Date: 16 November 2015 16:09:36

From: [36 Barfield Avenue](#)
[Yeadon](#)
[Leeds](#)
[LS19 7SH](#)

Date: 16th November 2015

Dear Sir / Madam,

Re: Site Reference HG2-10 (1221) Gill Lane Yeadon

I am writing to express my objection to the development of the site referenced above. My wife and I have lived in Yeadon for 36 years. Within the past 10 years this area has already taken 2400 new homes. We seen no improvement plans that would support these proposals. It MUST be taken into consideration, that the local infrastructure has already had to absorb the dramatic rise in traffic let alone other essential services; Dr's Surgeries, Schools etc.

References to works carried out at Horsforth roundabout intimate that this has resolved the pressing issue of congestion on the A65. This is absolutely NOT the case. I frequent the A65 daily & traffic already queues from Horsforth roundabout right back to Penny's Farm. The addition of yet further traffic generated by the new homes in these proposals will have a crippling effect.

My objection is based on the following points:

1. The plan for the site was **NOT positively prepared**. There has not been a comprehensive & relevant Greenbelt Review. Without the diligence of local action groups, we would not have been aware of these proposals, which have not therefore had the full involvement of the community or taken into account it's needs.
2. These plans are **UN SOUND** & as mentioned in point (1) without diligence of local action groups, we would not have even been aware of these proposals. They are also unsound on the grounds that the local Library in Rawdon was supplied the wrong maps (Aire Valley maps NOT Aireborough) This being inaccurate & misleading. Council POP ups were NOT advertised locally & residents did not receive any literature through the door, excluding **35% of the Leeds population from this consultation who are not 'on line', which is Legally non compliant**.
3. Considering local Ecology/Landscape/Trees/Conservation & Heritage - The proposals are for development of a site defended as Greenbelt in 1994. This historic pasture land is still farmed and has more than 21 mature & rare English trees (including Red Oak). It is abundant with wildlife, being habitat to Woodpeckers, Owls, bats and badgers) it is also adjacent to a CONSERVATION AREA and according to Historic England, THIS SITE SHOULD BE PART OF IT. They clearly state that it is an **UN SOUND Proposition for development:**
"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)"Historic England in their details to LCC 21/10/2015

4. This proposal is **UNJUSTIFIED** as it would merge Nether Yeadon with Guiseley and Henshaw, which is part of continuous Greenbelt between Leeds and Bradford & prevents urban sprawl between the two. Also, the council omitted the inclusion of a series of listed buildings along the perimeter and has acknowledged only one listed building.
5. This proposal is **NOT LEGALLY COMPLIANT** and is **NOT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE NPPF**. The housing target of 70,000 on which the Council has based its Core Strategy is INACCURATE and the Council has NOT revised these figures despite ONS projections of 45,000. The Council has also IGNORED the NPPF which states that **Green belt ONLY be used in "exceptional circumstances"**. The Green space of Gill Lane is a **VITAL space** increasing the biodiversity and sustainability of the local area; absorbing noise, providing drainage systems & countering effects of pollution.

As already stated, the impact on already stretched resources would be huge: Schools, Dr's, Dentists etc. There would be huge impact on local roads (both in the 'state of' AND 'traffic levels') not to mention road safety issues. Within the Leeds area there are plenty of opportunities for housing in EXISTING buildings, premises & land that are currently derelict and empty and which would be MORE suitable for housing if that is the main objective. Plus the infrastructure already exists to support these.

Between 2004 up to to September 2015 there have been between 15,000 and 17,000 empty properties city wide (Data from LCC Data Mill). By facilitating development of areas such as this, the Council are effectively allowing developers to cherry pick the **MOST DESIRABLE/PROFITABLE sites WITHOUT** consideration for the communities.

Crucially, this proposal cannot be taken in isolation; Yeadon, Guiseley, Rawdon and Horsforth are ALL being subject to this **UNJUSTIFIABLE** plan and all our Green spaces are being threatened because of it. Section 9 of the NPPF serves to protect greenbelt and this is being IGNORED by LCC across Aireborough, this is unacceptable. Too much green space is being used to meet unproven targets and sites are being allocated that **contravene NPPF guidelines**.

In conclusion, these developments are inconsistent with both National Policy and the Core Strategy and **Site HG2-10** – locally known to the community as Gill Lane should therefore **NOT** be included.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of the above.

Yours sincerely,

Mr James Jackson

Sent from my iPhone