

# MENSTON AND GUISELEY GREEN BELT PROTECTION GROUP

## Your last chance to have your say to save the Ings Fields



### Guidance Notes on how to respond to Leeds City Council's Public Consultation on Housing

You may think it is a done deal already; it will be if we do nothing!

You may think that the development of the Ings will not affect you but even if you are not close to the proposed housing it will impact on your travel time with traffic jams, your children's school places, your wait for a doctor's appointment, and the queues at the supermarket checkout.

### **You have until 5pm on Monday 16<sup>th</sup> November to respond to Leeds Plans.**

This is the response that will count, you may have written before, but this is the official and final consultation. The **Menston and Guiseley Green Belt Protection Group** have put together these guidance notes to help you make your response to LCC. We believe that if enough people make the right noises it is possible we could overturn the plans for the Ings.

As the form Leeds has issued is very difficult to fill in, both on line and on paper, we recommend you email or write a letter, which has been confirmed as being acceptable. If you have already sent a form there is nothing to stop you writing as well. If you have looked at the form and become daunted and put off by it, say so. If you still wish to try the on-line form these notes should help.

When you write there are **certain things you should comment on to make your response valid**. (listed below). Each resident has the right to make a response, even children, as it is their future this will affect. Every response will be read and noted and presented to the planning inspector before the hearing, (much like a court of law) which will be held sometime next year. All responses will be published.

### **We need as many people to write as possible, however much or little they have to say.**

**Email** to: [sap@leeds.gov.uk](mailto:sap@leeds.gov.uk)

**Letter** to: LDF Publication Draft Consultation, Forward Planning, The Leonardo Building, 2 Rossington Street, Leeds LS2 8HD

Could you please email me, if you can, to say you have responded? I can use your email to keep you informed of further developments. [mandggpg@gmail.com](mailto:mandggpg@gmail.com).

If you have internet access you will find all the information you need at

<https://aireboroughnf.wordpress.com/aireborough-site-allocations/ings-lane-new-birks-farm-3026-hg2-1/> with links to the form and all documents. You will also find my draft report there which may give you more ideas for comment.

## **The rest of this guide is designed to help you make your response**, in whatever form you choose.

The form asks for comments on the following headings, try and put these or some of these in your letter. If you find parts of the response difficult and would rather leave them out, then do. **Please use your own words and speak from your local knowledge and experience.**

- Make sure you give your full name and address
- Say your comments will be relating to The Leeds Site Allocation Plan
- Say the section of the plan you will be commenting on is HG2-1 (3026) New Birks Farm Ings Lane Guiseley.
- You need to state whether you agree or disagree with the proposed use of this site for housing.
- You need to state that **you do not consider the Leeds Site Allocation Plan to be sound**. This is because:

### **1.The plan is not justified**

- Leeds 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.
- They have not involved communities in the drawing up of their plans.
- For each site Leeds have done a sustainability appraisal where they have researched how each will impact on the community and how the new residents will access amenities. They include no transport reviews or ecology reports which are two main points many people are concerned about and contain mistakes due to lack of research.

### **2.The Plan is not positively prepared**

- There are not enough facilities to cope with the number of houses proposed in Aireborough.
- The A65 is congested.
- No real assessment has been done on the access to each site or the extra traffic it will create.
- Doctors and dentists can only just cope.
- 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.
- Leeds have not done a housing needs survey, so it is possible that developers will plan to build larger houses for obvious reasons. The ANDF emerging housing survey suggests the area needs affordable houses for first time buyers and those suitable for couples downsizing.
- Leeds Housing target of 70,000 has been described as aspirational. Revised figures suggest a much lower figure but LCC will not change their target. A lower figure would reduce the amount of Green Belt required to meet the plan.

### **3.The Plan is not effective**

- 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 but not enough consideration is given to this.

**Now make your own comments using these points specific to The Ings Site. Expand with your thoughts and experiences.**

There are 5 official greenbelt purposes.

1. To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas
2. To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another
3. To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
4. To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns
5. To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Do you think this site fulfils these Green Belt purposes? Comment.

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

**Mire Beck** is susceptible to overflowing into the fields on a regular basis.

**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. (here is an opportunity to comment on traffic on Ings Lane, particularly where residents have to park on the roadside, also doctors dentists school places etc).

**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 = 412 just short of the development on High Royds.

If you can think of any small pockets of land within Aireborough which could take small developments of 5-10 houses identify them.

## **Now we need to prove the plan is not legally compliant....**

There are two areas to comment on here.

### **1. Leeds City Council have not fulfilled their duty of Community involvement.**

- LCC's document of community involvement was written in 2007. It is out of date and does not include their duty to collaborate with forums and parish and town councils designated to draw up neighbourhood plans. Many feel they have not been consulted fully in the whole site allocation process.
- **Were** you told of the 8 week consultation period, or the fact LCC were holding a drop in meeting in Guiseley by LCC? Did the ANDF and MAGGPG leaflets do that job?
- **No** genuine attempt was made to engage with the community or to help them understand what is being proposed or how to respond to the consultation.
- **There** was one advert in Aireborough on a phone box in Guiseley which was taken down three weeks into the consultation!
- **No** where do any documents state that 90% of Aireborough's sites are on Green Belt.
- **Documents** refer to Green Belt as Greenfield which is misleading and suggests that land has already lost its Green Belt Status.
- A fully comprehensive Green Belt review has not been carried out as specified by the inspector at the Core Strategy hearing.

### **2. Leeds City Council have not fulfilled their Duty to Cooperate**

- In their background paper of September 2015, one meeting is recorded with City of Bradford Council on 6<sup>th</sup> March.
- Do you think that in one meeting they could have discussed all the points on which they should cooperate? Minutes for this meeting have been requested but are not forthcoming.
- In the Leeds Local Plan, a comprehensive review of Green Belt should have taken place alongside Bradford. Many of our sites have boundaries with Bradford. Aireborough is a fringe area. There is no evidence this has taken place

## **Next we will comment on how Leeds can make the plan sound.**

Use your own words and expand on the following points

- 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

---

Ask to be present at the inspector's hearing if you think you might like to go. You can always decline if you change your mind. Ask for acknowledgement of your response and to be informed of the submission of the plan for public examination and/or the adoption.

**The Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum have arranged a number of 'pop up' sessions for members of the community to attend should they require help in completing their response forms, or to obtain any further advice. These sessions will be held on the following dates:-**

**31 October, All Day at Morrison's, Guiseley**

**4 November, 4.30pm – 8.00pm at Queensway School**

**11 November, 2.00pm – 7.00pm Guiseley Methodist Church**

The ANDF are using a campaign called "Local Giving" to raise funds for the leaflets, photocopying, and room bookings for the pop ups. If you could donate up to £10, the amount will be match funded by Local Giving; so you donate £10 and the Forum gets £20! The scheme runs out soon, and there are still some matched funds left. Their account is here <https://localgiving.com/charity/aireboroughdnf> The Forum has been a great help to our group with support and technical advice; so this would be a good way to help them help us.

**The deadline for responses to the Council is 5pm on Monday 16 November. This is your last chance to make your views known. Good luck with your response. I know there is a lot to comment on but if we make an effort now there is a chance we could make a difference. Remember to try and change my wording and add your own views and experiences wherever possible as individual responses count for more than cut and paste and direct copies.**

**If you have any queries please don't hesitate to contact me on [mandggpg@gmail.com](mailto:mandggpg@gmail.com), or 01943875640  
Liz Kirkpatrick.**