

**Comments on Leeds Site Allocation Plan.**

Name and address

Mr F. A. Mostyn

Representor number:- PRS02864

26 Dunstarn Lane, Adel

Leeds, LS16 8EL

Email contact

**I wish to comment on the Leeds Site Allocation Plan**

**Comment on sites already in the plan**

Phase	Plan Ref.	SHLAA	Address	Capacity	Type
Already in Plan	HG1-72	1033	Government Buildings Site, Lawnswood	130	Brown field
Already in Plan	HG1-73	1299a	Bodington Hall	126	Brown field
Already in Plan	HG1-74	687	Dunstarn Lane	28	Green field
Already in plan	HG1-60	685	Tile Lane, Eastmoor	67	Brown field

**Comment**

*These sites that are already in the plan utilise 3 areas that are 'Brown field', which must be the land that is first developed, before 'Green field' or even 'Green Belt' is considered. These 4 sites have a total capacity of 351 units. It should be remembered that Adel has previously had significant developments in recent times at Oaklands, Sadler Way, Centurion Fields, and Eastmoor; this is a significant amount of development, and clearly a fair share of new housing.*

*I believe that the Dunstarn Lane site is likely to entail the removal of trees that are covered by Tree Preservation Orders – the trees should remain preserved.*

**Additional sites outside the Adel Neighbourhood Plan area that we would recommend for development .**

Plan ref.HG2-34 Farrar Lane

Plan ref HG2-30 Site of the Eyrie Pub, Holtdale Approach

Plan ref. HG2-31 Land at the corner of Otley Old Road and Holtdale Approach

Plan ref. HG2-32 Cookridge Fire station, Otley Old Road

**Comment**

*These are brownfield sites that should be developed before any consideration of building on 'Green field' sites.*

## Sites that we are opposed to for development

Comment on Plan ref. HG2-18

Church Lane Adel

*It is astonishing that this 'Green field' site is included in the Plan, since it was previously turned down for development by a Government inspector. The Adel St John Church is of historic importance, which requires retention of the setting. Church Lane is not suitable for more traffic access, and the A660 road on the opposite site is already heavily used by cars, commercial vehicles and buses, hence clearly unsuitable for more traffic onto it and off it.*

*This site will not enhance the historic Adel Church and its surrounds, with effect on visual impact, and potential impacts from pollution, traffic and noise.*

Comment on Plan ref. HG2-38

Dunstarn Lane

*This is 'Green Belt' that is used for farming and should remain so. The land contains and attracts a wide range of wildlife. It is close to Meanwood Valley (the Meanwood Conservation Area), hence forms an important part of the 'urban lung' for this total area (Adel, Meanwood, Headingley etc) of Leeds. With increasing population and traffic pollution this is a highly important point. Additional traffic from any such development will exacerbate the congestion on adjacent roads and junctions.*

*The local roads are narrow, and are heavily used by the local traffic, as well as traffic from outlying districts taking 'rat runs'. Additionally, the proposed developments of local 'Brownfield' sites in the area will greatly increase the traffic along Long Causeway and Adel Lane. The traffic lights junction of Long Causeway onto the Leeds Outer Ring Road – 'A' designated highway road – is constantly busy.*

*The public transport within walking distance is limited to one bus service, that is often infrequent, hence new residents will be car users to their employment and shops, of which there are negligible in this area.*

*The local primary schools already have capacity issues. This area of Adel already has a shortage of places in the local primary schools (within walking distance), and secondary schools are not on bus routes, nor nearby, and we understand that places in them are extremely limited. Developments that are already planned will exacerbate these difficulties. Increased car usage becomes a likely consequence.*

*This 'Green belt' must not be lost, and I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to warrant it being taken out of 'Green belt' and re-designated as 'Green field', and then being approved for development.*

*This site benefits the wider community, including the important health considerations through air quality.*

*In a letter, dated 25<sup>th</sup> July 2013, to Mr D. Feeney at LCC Development Enquiry Centre, I covered my points of objection to the proposed designation of this land, and that it should be designated as a "RED" site not suitable for development. My points remain.*

*This is an 'Unsound' inclusion in the 'Plan'*

## Unallocated sites

### Site Address

Site ref. 1243 Back Church Lane former -Rectory Paddock Green belt

Site ref. 1246 Back Church Lane- Former Rectory Paddock Green belt

Site ref. 1299B Otley Road, Bodington Hall

Site ref. 2052 Tile Lane

Site ref. 3360A Cookridge Golf Club (s)

Site ref. 3360B Cookridge Golf Club (n)

Site ref. 4157 Land East of Sadler Way

Site ref. 4153 Eccup Lane

Site ref. 4159 Otley Road, Adel

Site ref. 4160 Adel Mill

Site ref. 4161Otley Road

Site ref. Lawnswood Arms

Site ref. 4251 Land at Eccup Lane

Site ref. 1079 Long Causeway

Site ref.1178B Dunstarn Lane (Land South)

### Comment

***With the exceptions of Site ref 1299B and the Lawnswood Arms, all the sites listed above are currently 'Green belt' and should remain as such. It is essential for current and future generations that areas retain a mix of development and 'Green belt'. The infrastructure and local facilities are inadequate for an increase of development in this area, which already has had a significant amount of development, and more in progress or imminent.***

Comments on other sites within the Site Allocation Plan

*From study of the Site Allocations Plan Section 3: Area Proposals: 5.North there are many sites for which development has not started. These developments total a significant number of units, so their effects on local issues and the need for housing has yet to be experienced. The 'Brown field' sites should be the priority developments before any 'Green belt' or even 'Green field'.*

*I expect that this situation is replicated in other areas.*

*Further, I note in the Site Allocations Plan Section 3: Area Proposals: 5.North that the sites are listed as 'Green field', but I have a strong belief that many (all?) of these are in fact 'Green belt'. Why has this designation changed? Surely a Consultation exercise and consideration by a Planning Inspector should occur first, rather than this manoeuvre.*

Tests of plan

*The plan does not recognize (let alone address in any way) the crucial infrastructure issues that already exist in the area, such as traffic, schools, health services and local amenities. To consider development of 'Green belt' sites in not an acceptable solution in the short term nor the longer term, and certainly never before all brownfield sites in Leeds have been developed. The health benefits of 'Green belt' sites should not be overlooked; the environment and air quality are vital. The extra traffic will inevitably increase the air pollution.*

*I do not believe that 'Exceptional or Special Circumstances' exist with respect to re-designation of 'Green belt', so should not be included in the Site Allocations Plan 2015.*

*The types of housing that are required seems to be overlooked, especially as 'Green field' sites are likely to see developers want to build detached, expensive properties in seemingly desirable locations. There is a need to provide housing for older residents, who may wish to downsize or need to downsize due to age effects, yet wish to remain in the locality near to family and friends. It will be highly unlikely that properties for first time buyers will be built, and 'affordable housing' in these areas will be out of the reach of first time buyers, and probably beyond low/middle income earners.*

*The Plan is not effective in addressing the housing demand through this potential supply. It will not achieve the type of housing required.*

*I consider that the Plan is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework.*

I wish for my comments to be taken into account by the Planning Inspector.

I do not wish to take part in the forthcoming Public Examination.

Signature

Date 08/11/2015