

PDH00333

28 Moorland Crescent,  
Mexston, Ilkley,

LS29 6AF.

2nd Nov, 2015.

LDF Publication Draft Consultation,  
Forward Planning and Implementation,  
The Leonardo Building,  
2 Rossington Street,  
LEEDS LS2. 8HJ.

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

Response to LDF Publication Draft Consultation - Leeds Site Allocation Plan  
Section HQ-2-1 (3026) New Birks Farm, Tugstare, Guiseley.

Dear Sir or Madam,

I disagree with this site being used for housing and I do not consider the Leeds Site Allocation Plan to be sound. The plan is not justified because a comprehensive Green Belt Review, asked for by the Inspector of the Core Strategy, has not been carried out. As far as I can see, only the Green Belt sites selected for development have been reviewed and the local communities have not been involved in the plans. For each site, LCC's sustainability appraisal has not researched how each site will impact on the community and how new residents will access amenities. There are no transport reviews or ecology reports & those that do exist contain mistakes arising from lack of research & local knowledge.

The Plan is not positively prepared. Currently there are insufficient facilities to cope with planned housing. Cllr Richard Norris has publicly admitted that the A65 is congested and accessing each site & the <sup>extra</sup> traffic created by each one has not been properly assessed. The infrastructure is already nearly at breaking point and access to hospital services, doctors & dentists is already extremely difficult. I am unaware of any housing needs strategy from LCC & in the absence of this, building developers will plan for larger houses for more revenue. Also Leeds C.C. are targeting 70,000 houses even though revised office of

National Statistics figures suggest 44,500 is a more applicable target. Lower figures would reduce the amount of Green Belt potentially required for the plan. Once lost, Green Belt cannot be regained for future generations.

I also have major concerns that the Plan is not effective. Surely neighbouring councils should collaborate when planning in terms of roads + congestion, but instead of this developments in Melton, Bulley + Appley Bridge would all impact on the A65 + neighbouring roads.

Specifically relating to HQ-2-1 (3026), greenbelt is in situ to check unrestricted built-up sprawl, prevent neighbouring towns + villages merging, to safeguard the countryside, preserve the setting + character of individual historic areas and to assist urban regeneration. Site HQ-2-1(3026) fulfils four of these purposes. Not developing this area will prevent urban sprawl and the merging of settlements, safeguard the countryside + encourage the development of brownfield areas. The site is in active use, is grade 3 agricultural land with a well trodden footpath, is susceptible to overflowing from the beck and is a home to diverse fauna. The area has landscape value, is intrinsically beautiful, defines Guiseley from Melton and was defined as a Special Landscape Area in the 2006 UDP. Why has it lost this status? As well as infrastructure problems which would develop from building on this site, a further worry is the sewage pollution which has recently been experienced, resulting from poor sewers, which Yorkshire Water have stated are struggling to cope with existing housing.

I do not feel that needs have fulfilled their duty of community involvement as the 2007 document is out of date, people have not been fully consulted, information about consultation has come only from a voluntary group and there has been no attempt to fully engage with us, the residents in this already developed area. 90% of the sites for allocation for development are on Green Belt + where documents do refer to the land it is referred to as Greenfield, implying a different status. If the Inspector at the Core Strategy hearing specified the need for a fully comprehensive Green Belt review, that is what should have taken place.

I believe that, to make the plan sound, the housing target should be reduced from 70,000 to 44,000 (ONS data), it should abide by the NPPF, Brownfield should be developed first to enhance the living environment for those near these areas and a thorough infrastructure plan should be in place before the site allocations plan. As well as carrying out a Green Belt review, engaging better with communities + cooperating better with Bradford council, building where the infrastructure is sound and where there are jobs available would enhance the living + environmental conditions for ALL residents + still allow for easily accessible green spaces for everyone.

Please acknowledge my letter and inform me of the submission of any future plans for public examination and/or the adoption.

Yours faithfully,

