

PD400267

33 Ings Lane
Guiseley
LEEDS
LS20 8DA

LDF Public Draft consultation
Forward Planning & Implementation
The Leonardo Building
2 Rossington Street
LEEDS
LS2 8HD

DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT			
To	Action	Info	File
- 3 NOV 2015			
File Number			

30 October 2015

Dear Sirs

**RESPONSE TO LDF PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION - LEEDS SITE ALLOCATION PLAN
SECTION HG-2-1 NEW BIRKS FARM, INGS LANE, GUISELEY**

I disagree with the above site being used for housing. I do not consider the Leeds site allocation plan to be sound.

The plan is not justified:

- LCC have not done a comprehensive green belt review as was asked for by the inspector of the core strategy. They have only reviewed green belt sites which were selected for development.
- LCC have not involved communities in the drawing up of plans
- 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 contain mistakes due to lack of research and local knowledge.

The plan is not positively prepared:

- There are not enough facilities to cope with the number of houses proposed in Aireborough.
- The A65 is congested. Councillor Richard Lewis has admitted this on BBC "Look North".
- No real assessment has been done on the access to each site, or the extra traffic it will create. **Ings Lane is not wide enough for two cars when residents park on the road.** This would potentially cause problems for Fire Engines to access the new housing.
- Doctors and dentists can only just cope. Yesterday I was told by Park Road Medical centre that the waiting list to get a blood test was two weeks!
- For each site Leeds have assessed what infrastructure is present now, ie how far is the site away from a school, bus stop, a train station, a doctors' surgery, play areas, and made no recommendations as to what needs to be put in place to accommodate the new households.

It is already impossible to get a seat on the trains to Leeds from Guiseley in rush hour. In fact not only must one stand, but also be squashed!

- 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 Statistics figures suggest a much lower figure of 44,500 but LCC will not change their target even though Councillor Green admitted on television in a "Made in Leeds" interview that they conceded the figure is nearer 6,000. A lower figure would reduce the amount of green belt required to meet the plan.

The Plan is not effective:

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

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

There are five official greenbelt purposes

1. To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas
2. To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another
3. To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
4. To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns
5. To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The site fulfils four out of the five above purposes. Development here will result in urban sprawl, will result in the two named settlements of Guiseley and Menston merging along Mire Beck, will safeguard the countryside from encroachment and by not using this site for housing will mean that Brownfield sites within Leeds will be regenerated by developers as the easily prepared green belt will not be available.

- The site is still in active economic use, is Grade 3 agricultural land, and there is a well-trodden footpath through the area.
- There will be a loss of valuable agricultural land. Mire Beck is susceptible to overflowing into the fields on a regular basis. I witnessed this first hand when I lived in Cairn Garth.
- The site is identified in the Leeds Habitat network and is home to diverse fauna.
- 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 the intrinsic beauty
- 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
- It was a special landscape area in 2006 UDP but seems to have lost its status.

- The local infrastructure 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 from 2000, resulting in almost of its brownfield sites being developed as factories have closed, leaving little local employment.
- There have been instances of sewage pollution in Mire Beck due to the poor state of the sewers in the area. Yorkshire Water have still not solved the problem and have admitted that the present state of the sewer network is struggling to cope.
- If 298 houses are built on the fields HG1-2 and a further 114 on the other side of the railway on PAS land HG3-1 making 412, that is just short of the major development on High Royds which is close by.

The plan is not legally compliant

LCC have not fulfilled their duty of community involvement

LCC's document of community involvement was written in 2007. It is out of date and does not include their duty to collaborate with forums and parish and town councils designated to draw up neighbourhood plans. Many feel they have not been consulted fully in the whole site allocation process. The only reason that I was aware of the the LCC drop in meeting in Guiseley was down to the efforts of 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. There was one advert in Aireborough on a phone box in Guiseley which was taken down three weeks into the consultation.

Nowhere on any documents does it state that 90% of Aireborough's sites are on green belt. Documents refer to green belt as Greenfield which is misleading and suggests the land has already lost its green belt status. A fully comprehensive Green Belt review has not been carried out as specified by the inspector at the Core Strategy hearing.

LCC have not fulfilled their duty to co-operate.

In their background paper of September 2015, one meeting is recorded with the City of Bradford council on 6 March. I doubt the meeting could have covered all the points on which they should co-operate. Minutes for this meeting have been requested to verify this, but have not been forthcoming. In the Leeds Local Plan, a comprehensive review of Green Belt should have taken place alongside Bradford. Many of Aireborough's sites have boundaries with Bradford. Aireborough is a fringe area. There is no evidence this has taken place.

How LCC can make the plan sound

1. Reduce the Leeds housing target from 70,000 to 44,000 (Office National Statistics data)
2. Abide by the National Planning Policy Framework
3. Start the plan again with a better methodology eg. Brownfield first policy
4. Have an infrastructure plan in place before the site allocation plan
5. Build closer to areas with better infrastructure

6. Build closer to where the bulk of the jobs are eg central Leeds
7. Carry out a comprehensive Green Belt review
8. Genuinely engage with local communities
9. Co-operate fully (and openly) with Bradford council

I wish to be present at the inspectors hearing.

I would like acknowledgement of my response, and to be informed of the submission of the plan for public examination and/or the adoption.

Yours faithfully

CLEO HOWELL (MS)