



3 Highwood Crescent  
Moortown  
Leeds  
LS17 6ER

12<sup>th</sup> November 2015

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

PDM01917

HG2-2 Wills Gill HG2-1 Ings Lane HG2-3 Shaw Lane / Banksfield  
HG2-5 and HG2-6 Coach Road and Silverdale Allotments  
HG2-4 Hollins Hill / Hawkstone Avenue HG2-9 Victoria Avenue

Dear Sir / Madam,

I am writing to object to developments on the sites referenced above.

Guiseley has already taken it's fair share of new development and this is yet another opportunity for developers to build unnecessary housing on what are clearly the most profitable sites. This is not being done for a proven housing need, it's being driven by profit and greed and this is in clear breach of the NPPF.

The council should reject these proposals on green belt sites and should be looking to review it's unproven housing figures NOW, it should be proposing sites nearer to the existing infrastructure, take advantage of new brownfield funds and schemes and force developers to look at these first, conserve conservation areas and to engage with the local communities in a transparent and genuine way. I travel through this area and can see the gradual decline in green space, the urbanization, the mills and industrial sites now retail parks and housing estates. We need to preserve the few remaining green sites that make this area of Leeds so attractive.

Brownfield sites are available which should be developed first as per the Core Strategy. Brownfield sites identified in the SHLAA have been excluded from this allocation. Green belt - which should only be used in exceptional circumstances - is being used FIRST in a phased land release. How can the Council justify this?

Green belt is supposed to be permanent and developments on these spaces should be a last resort.

The housing target of 70,000 on which the Council has based its Core Strategy is wrong. Despite projections of 45,000 the Council has not revised it's figures. Why? By the time a review is done the profitable green belt sites will be lost. How can these sites be pushed through first?

These plans do not take into account our needs as a community nor have we had full involvement. One Guiseley drop in with no signage? In a church with limited parking? Local action groups made me aware of these proposals. It wasn't broadcast on social media, radio, newsletters. As a result a large proportion of the population are unaware of the issues that affect them or have had chance to comment. How fair is that?

To develop on these sites would create urban sprawl and would ruin the identity and character of Guiseley. NPPF states that the merging of communities is to be prevented. How then can the Council justify the Plan in light of these planning requirements?

How can a Plan that allocates housing on green belt and on the strategic green infrastructure - which is against Core Strategy- be deemed positively prepared? It fails to deliver suitable infrastructure another NPPF requirement. Our resources - schools dentists, doctors - are already stretched and traffic levels are already unacceptable. Half hearted promises are not guaranteed and nor do the Council enforce them. "Lack of viability" seems a great get out cause for developers once the bulldozers move in. (High Royds Menston a prime example, unfinished and not quite the community village promised).

The site allocations plan is unsound because the Council has not carried out a genuinely comprehensive Green Belt review. How can this be legally compliant? Proposing green belt sites and not doing a proper review? The plan is not in accordance with the NPPF - Section 9 of the NPPF serves to protect greenbelt.

The plan is not effective - these houses will not be of the mix and value that we need. Large properties commanding premium prices or lots of small lego houses crammed into one site - both trying to maximize profits with no regard for the area.

There has been little regional co ordination with Bradford Council either despite the impact of neighbourouring Councils and their proposals (Menston). One meeting - with residents or Councils - does not constitute a duty to cooperate.

These sites are habitat rich with special historical value. HG2-1 HG2-2 HG2-5 HG2-9 are all categorized as UNSOUND in the report by Historic England. How can the Council's Plan be justified, effective, positively prepared or LEGAL on this basis alone?

..”this site should not be allocated unless there are clear public benefits that outweigh the harm (as is required by NPPF, Paragraph 133 or 134)”.

**Our Council are paying lip service to communities, but are paying full attention to developers. The fact that the Plan fails on so many planning points is evidence enough, but most importantly it fails our communities and they are failing as guardians of our City.**

Yours faithfully

  
Mr Chris Storey