

TD100386.

Hillside Ridge
61 Hillside Avenue
Guiseley
Leeds
LS20 9DH

| DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT | | | |
|------------------------|--------|------|------|
| To | Action | Info | File |
| - 5 NOV 2015 | | | |
| File Number | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

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

E: sap@leeds.gov.uk

4 November 2015

**RE: Response to LDF Publication Draft Consultation – Leeds Site Allocation Plan
Section HG-2-1 (3026) New Birks Farm: Ings Lane: Guiseley**

I disagree with the site being used for housing and do not consider the Leeds Site Allocation plan to be workable.

I have lived in the area since birth and seen many changes to the landscape. It is with sadness that I find Leeds City Council feel it is justified to take away our Green Belts, diminish our landscape and alter the way we live our everyday lives. 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. 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 contains mistakes due to lack of research and local knowledge.

Guiseley already suffers from severe traffic congestion every day and pollution is on the increase from fumes and discarded rubbish due to housing estate popping up almost everywhere in Aireborough. As a local resident my commuting is mainly done on foot now due to the length of time taken to drive anywhere. With the current road infrastructure in place it cannot cope with increased traffic caused by more housing; Councillor Richard Lewis has admitted this on BBC "Look North". It would appear that Leeds and Bradford are not collaborating when planning where housing is planned in terms of roads and traffic congestion. Developments in Menston, Burley and Apperley Bridge will all impact on the A65. Not enough consideration is given to this.

Local schools in the area are currently oversubscribed and no new school plans are in place to cope with the influx of children brought on by the new housing plans. For each site Leeds have assessed what infrastructure is present now, i.e. how far is the site away from a school, bus stop, a train station, a doctor's surgery, and made no recommendations as to what needs to be put in place to accommodate the new households. Why should local residents be unable to place their children in a school of their choice due to Leeds City Council issuing planning permission left, right and centre? I would like to mention that there has been no increase in Doctor Surgeries in the area and I know as a resident how hard it is to get into a local practice and book appointment within a reasonable time.

I have listed some points below to highlight the **negative** affect building on the named site would have: -

The proposed site is in active economic use, is Grade 3 agricultural land and there is a well-trodden footpath through the area and there will be loss of valuable agricultural land.

Mire Beck is susceptible to overflowing into the fields on a regular basis and 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 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 the 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 all 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. YW 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 as High Royds, which is close by.

I was completely unaware of the plans in the area for extra housing and only by the continued awareness brought by the Aireborough Neighbour Hood Development Forum have been able to pen this letter. I feel that LCC have failed to supply information and make residents aware of pending housing plans over our beautiful green belts and although we are not classed as being in 'an area of outstanding natural beauty', it is to me, and ask to please look at the evidence and stop this almost criminal action taking place.

I have made a list below that I feel should be looked at during the consultation.

- Reduce the Leeds housing target from 70,000 to 44,000 (ONS data)
- Abide by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- Start the plan again with a better methodology e.g. Brownfield first policy
- Have an infrastructure plan in place before the site allocations plan.
- Build closer to areas with better infrastructure
- Build closer to where the bulk of the jobs are, e.g. Central Leeds.
- Carry out a comprehensive Green Belt review
- Genuinely engage with local communities.
- Cooperate fully with Bradford Council

Lastly, I would like to be present at the inspector's hearing and 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

Mrs G Smith