

# Aireborough (Yeadon)

## Response to Site Allocations Issues and Options – Otley and Yeadon Ward. – July 2013

Cllr Colin Campbell, Cllr Ryk Downes, Cllr Sandy Lay

### Retail issues and options.

Maintaining the vitality of Yeadon's shopping centre is key to maintaining it as a freestanding town in its own right. A loss of this individuality would turn it into an anonymous suburb of the larger city. The Council should encourage local shopping and make every effort to enhance / improve the centre of the town.

In general we support the designations for the centre of Yeadon and believe the primary/secondary shopping areas reflect the current situation in the town.

We would however make the following comments.

1. There is no clear policy to maintain, enhance or improve primary shopping areas and we feel the LDF should have a strategy to address this.
2. There seems to be no clear policy on preventing certain types of units predominating in one area. For example Charity Shops which over the last few years have (because of advantageous business rates and low staff costs) come to predominate on certain primary frontages. Because of this other traders are forced into secondary areas or out of business. (This could also refer to hot food takeaways or drinking establishments). The Council should have a policy to encourage diversity.
3. Policies should be put in place to encourage start-ups possibly via favourable business rates for a limited period.
4. Policies to encourage and expand the market should also be brought forward.
5. Positive policies should be brought forward to encourage "living over the shop".

### Employment issues and options.

In Aireborough it should be recognised that there are a large number of small to medium sized businesses who provide a range of employment opportunities. The Council has identified possible new employment sites but has no clear proposals to prevent the loss of existing sites.

We would make the following comments.

1. Policies should be introduced to encourage and protect employment on existing sites.

2. New employment in existing centres should be encouraged. Particularly small scale enterprises.
3. We cannot see the need for and do not support the proposals for an industrial estate to the north of the airport.

## **Greenspace issue and options.**

Greenspace is important to the wellbeing of all residents of Leeds. Aireborough is perceived as a part of the city which because it is surrounded by green belt has an excess of greenspace. Unfortunately this does not reflect the reality that much of the area is not accessible and therefore it should not be seen as an excuse for failing to create new public spaces.

We appreciate the work which has gone into identifying existing areas but there should be a presumption in favour of creating more usable space, particularly by developers (rather than refurbishing existing).

Strongly disagree with the documents use of the words “Surplus”. It is said there are surplus allotments in the area but with several hundred names on waiting lists this cannot be so. Surplus in the LDF context seems to mean more than other areas so policy should to increase all rather than only in certain areas.

We would like to make the following comments.

1. The Chevin is a district park rather than local one.
2. Yeadon Tarn has one of the highest visitor numbers of any park in Leeds and needs to be regarded as a district wide resource. This leaves the rest of the area with limited other “park” space.
3. There should be a clear policy in favour of the provision of new parks.
4. There should be clear provision for new playing fields (including bowling greens), equipped children’s play areas, allotments, and small amenity areas in housing developments.
5. The role of the Chevin and Yeadon Tarn as district resource should be recognised and they should be managed as such.
6. No existing green space should be sold off to pay for improvements / maintenance of other areas.

## **Housing issues and options**

Yeadon, as part of the Aireborough (and the wider Aire/Wharfe Valley) area has seen a significant amount of development over the last few years with little if any additions to the support infrastructure these developments need.

These developments have put an intolerable strain on local services which are all running at or in some cases beyond accepted capacity. There seems to be little or no recognition of this in the Council's proposals.

We should like to make the following comments.

1. As a general principle we believe the premise on which the housing numbers is based is flawed in that it makes wrong assumptions concerning population, demand and ability of developers to build.
2. We also believe it fails to deal with the questions of sustainability in that it makes no provision for infrastructure development, (schools, services, public transport, roads etc) but seems to assume that the existing networks will cope with any additional demand.
3. We believe there should be a presumption against loss of green fields in favour of re-use of existing brown field sites.
4. If there has to be some new housing it should reflect the needs of the local population rather than the profit margins of house builders. The Council/developers should provide an evidence base for the need for a development.
5. There needs to be recognition of the scale of recent housing developments in the area.
6. There needs to be recognition of the number of permissions which have not been built out (eg Highroyds).
7. There needs to be recognition of the high level of windfall sites which have come on the market in recent years.

Comments with regard to specific site designations

1255A Banksfield Mount, Yeadon. Agree site should not be developed for the reasons stated.

1255B Banksfield Mount, Yeadon. Site should not be developed for same reasons as 1255A plus issues with traffic using residential streets within an estate to access site.

2118 /3030 Haw Lane/Yeadon Banks, Yeadon. As a common this area should not have been included in the proposals.

3034 Cold Harbour Farm/Bayton Lane, Yeadon. Agree this site should not be developed because of loss of highly visible green belt which acts as a buffer between settlements along with major access issues.

3326 Land North of Bayton Lane, Yeadon. Agree this site should not be developed because of SEGI

3366 Harrogate Road, Yeadon. Concerns regarding impact on road network.