

PD100244

Andrew Felstead
10 Hillside Avenue
Guiseley
Leeds
LS20 9DH

LDF Publication Draft Consultant,
Forward Planning
The Leonardo Building,
2 Rossington Street,
Leeds
LS2 8HD

27-Oct-2015

DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT			
To	Action	Info	File
- 2 NOV 2015			
File Number _____			

Please confirm receipt of this letter to the above address or email address.

Comments relating to The Leeds Site Allocation Plan, section HG-2-1 (3026) New Brinks Farm Ings Lane Guiseley

Dear Sir / Madam,

I am writing to you in reference to the above, I am writing to confirm that I disagree with the proposed use of this site for housing and that other sites closer to Leeds city centre are in much need of regeneration before Green Belt land is considered for development. Such areas as Chapel Town, Armley and Bramley have large areas of Brown Field sites that offer a quick commute to the city centre and bigger infrastructures designed to cope with expansion.

It is important to note that the Green Belt land identified in this plan forms a natural boundary between Guiseley and Menston and was a Special Landscape Area in the 2006 UDP and this status appears to be ignored in the above plans.

I do not consider the Leeds Site Allocation Plan to be sound for the following reasons:

The Plan is not justified,

- Leeds do not appear to have completed a compressive Green Belt review as requested by the inspector of the Core; only green belt sites have been reviewed for development.
- The impacted communities have not been involved in the drawing up of plans.
- The transport review does not appear to be accurate or sound as the A65 in this area is already at bursting point at most times of the day making travel difficult for residents.

The Plan is not effective,

- ~~There are already significant developments taking place / completed in Guiseley, Apperley Bridge, Menston and Burley that have impacted the A65. It appears that these developments are done in isolation without consideration to the combined impacts to the traffic (A65), infrastructure or local communities.~~

The Plan is not positively prepared,

- As above the A65 is already congested, making travel for residents difficult at most times of the day. There does not appear to be any real consideration to the extra traffic this will create and how these sites will be accessed.
- The facilities, particularly doctors and dentists, in Aireborough are already stretched, adding more housing will make this situation worse.
- There does not appear to be a sound assessment of the current infrastructure and what additions will be required to accommodate this extra housing.
- There is nothing in place to ensure that developers build the required housing for first time / downsize buyers.
- There is no commitment to the actual number of houses required in Leeds. The figure of 70,000 has been revised to a much lower figure, yet the LCC has not revised this number. Obviously this could reduce the impact on green belt land.

The Plan is not legally compliant

- There has been little attempt to engage with the community to help them understand the proposal or impact to the area.
- The website and forms are unclear and difficult to complete, hence this letter, and are inaccessible to some people.
- A single advert in a phone box in Guiseley was sighted to alert the community to the proposal. This is not adequate.
- The documents fail to mention that 90% of the proposed site are Green Belt. In fact the documents refer to the Green Belt as 'Greenfield' suggesting that the area has already lost its green belt status. This is inaccurate and therefore should be reissued and consultation period reviewed.
- The required Green Belt review has not been conducted, or made available to review, as specified by the inspector at the Core Strategy hearing.

Considerations specific to site HG-2-1 (3026)

- The purpose of Green Belt land is to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into each other, the Ings defines Guiseley as a settlement separate to Menston with the Mire Beck forming a boundary. This development would merge the two, contrary to the purpose of green belt land.
- On the subject of the Mire Beck It is important to note that it is susceptible to regularly overflowing on to the Ings fields making this land difficult for development.
- The development in Menston High Royds and recent completion of two developments on Netherfield Road added in excess of 500 houses to the area. The Ings development would add a further 500 houses to an already overloaded infrastructure.
- The Ings site includes 19 trees with preservation orders and mature hedgerows. This site has been defined in the TPOs as adding to the landscape value and a feature of intrinsic beauty. This would be a loss to the area and wildlife using the site.

I therefore request that the Plan is reviewed and considers the following points:

- The plan adopts a different methodology and considers Brown Field Sites first, such as Bramley, Chapel Town and Armley, as I identified above, as these sites have existing infrastructures designed to cope with the expansion. These areas are closer to where the majority of jobs are, such as Leeds City Centre, making them more appealing to buyers.
- Consider the reduction in housing 70,000 to 44,000 as detailed in the ONS data.
- Ensure the infrastructure in Aireborough is developed before any housing is granted so that it can cope with the planned development.

I also request the following:

- I be invited to attend the hearing.
- This response is acknowledged either in writing or by email.
- To be informed of the submission of the plan for public examination and / or the adoption.

Andrew Felstead