

PD1101082

Mrs. Maureen C. Dunn

The White House

Old Pool Bank

Pool in Wharfedale

OTLEY

LS 21 1EJ

DEPARTMENT DEPARTMENT			
TO	ACCORD	INFO	File
17 NOV 2015			

10th November 2015

Dear Sir,

I wish to make comment on the following site in the Leeds Site Allocation Plan.

Plan Ref.	SHLAA	Address	Area	Capacity
HG 3-5	10956-1369	Old Pool Bank (land at) Pool in Wharfedale	23.1 ha	541

I disagree that the above site has potential for the allocation of future housing development because

a) Since the Unitary Development Plan several years ago designated the eastern part of this site as a PAS area, there has been a significant increase in the traffic using Old Pool Bank. This has been caused by the building of the new estate on Chapel Hill Road but mainly because of the use of both upper and lower Old Pool Bank as a rat run to avoid the congestion at the Dyrley Arms traffic lights. Various changes to the traffic lights have not eased the problem - in fact they have made it worse especially at peak times.

Old Pool Bank is a narrow country lane and cannot cope with the cars, vans and, at times, lorries and coaches which use it at present. The wing mirrors on my husband's car have been damaged on three occasions because of

ending cars on this road and we rarely use it now. There have been numerous similar incidents to other cars and several instances of road rage which my husband and I have witnessed from our garden. To further increase traffic on Old Pool Bank from another huge housing development would make an already dangerous situation much worse.

The congestion in Pool itself is also apparent with lorries frequently mounting the pavement on Main Street. Pedestrians, especially parents with pushchairs and children going to school are daily at risk. The knock on effects of developments to the north, east and west of Pool in Bramhope, Otley, North Yorks. and Bradford, as well as the planned development of Leeds/Bradford Airport mean that the Pool traffic problem can only get worse. There is a complete lack of planning for this.

b) There are virtually no local amenities in Pool to accommodate the needs of 541 extra homes (only a Post Office/General Store and a chemist). There is no doctor's surgery, and local employment is nil. Public transport is virtually non-existent, therefore a car is a necessity to live in Pool. The proposed development would lead to a massive increase in traffic on overcrowded roads which already struggle to meet present demands.

c) Pool Primary School is already full - where would the children from a new housing development receive their education? Because of the knock on effect of all the other developments surrounding Pool i.e. Bramhope, Otley there would also be pressure at secondary school level leading to the possibility of children having to travel out of the area to be educated.

d) The western part of the site is green belt, and this should be preserved. Once green belt is built on it is gone for ever.

3
comments on the soundness of the plan

I do not think that the plan is sound because

- a) It should be based on the Core strategy and infrastructure requirements should be taken into account. It is obvious that they have not.
- b) The plan is not the most appropriate strategy and the Council are not justified in allocating these sites because the strategic aim should be to reuse the brown field land before the green field and green belt land.
- c) The plan is not deliverable as many of the sites are not suitable, particularly because the infrastructure is not in place and cannot be delivered. There is no space for additional schools and the roads are already congested.
- d) Because of the above failures the plan cannot be consistent with NPPF.

10th Nov. 2015