

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: A D Barr

Representor No: PRS00109

Representation ID: REP00515 Question Ref: H1

Change suggested - Green to Red Reason for change - This site is far too large for the infrastructure, which is saturated. This would add 1000 cars at peak rush hour to Elland Road, Churwell Hill. Not enough school places.

Name: Stephen Jones

Representor No: PRS00134

Representation ID: REP00906 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Green to Red

Local road for access already at capacity, alarming peak time congestion. Local facilities at capacity.

Name: Adam C Jones

Representor No: PRS00141

Representation ID: REP00916 Question Ref: H1

Green to red. Local road for access already at capacity. Local facilities at capacity.

Name: Brian Guy

Representor No: PRS00142

Representation ID: REP04659 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: R Louise Jones

Representor No: PRS00144

Representation ID: REP00918 Question Ref: H1

Green to Red. Local road for access already at capacity. Local facilities at capacity.

Name: Michael J Jones

Representor No: PRS00145

Representation ID: REP00919 Question Ref: H1

Local road for access at capacity. Local facilities at capacity.

Name: Ian Dickinson

Representor No: PRS00146

Representation ID: REP00920 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Green to red. Green Belt? No infrastructure. No scope for extra infrastructure eg. Roads or schools, health centres.

Name: Janice Dickinson

Representor No: PRS00147

Representation ID: REP00921 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Green to red. Area already overbuilt. Another 500+ houses will cause more traffic problems in area, no extra infrastructure set up.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Joyce Sanders

Representor No: PRS00148

Representation ID: REP00922 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Red. Brownfield sites should be used first. Facilities, all schools, doctors, dentists are full. The traffic will be impossible getting across our roads now is a nightmare.

Name: Dawn Commons

Representor No: PRS00166

Representation ID: REP01839 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Change from Green to Red. All schools, doctors, dentists are already full to capacity.

Name: Alan Sheard

Representor No: PRS00179

Representation ID: REP02106 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Green to amber. Green Belt land. Agricultural farm land, crops being grown, also site of old coal mine, possible subsidence and methane gas seepage.

Name: Ian Evans

Representor No: PRS00196

Representation ID: REP02123 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Green to red. Road infrastructure currently too congested, local schools and roads could not cope with increased capacity, will cause gridlock. Local schools report shortage.

Name: Jane Mawson

Representor No: PRS00198

Representation ID: REP02132 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Change from Green to Red. Green Belt. Access?

Name: M Mason

Representor No: PRS00199

Representation ID: REP02134 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Change from Green to Red. Any access to Churwell Hill will compound the present transport problems.

Name: Kevin Doherty

Representor No: PRS00200

Representation ID: REP02133 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Green to red. One of the last areas of greenery. Schools are not available, and traffic is already chaotic. This will frequently bring Churwell to a standstill traffic wise.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Andrea Armstrong

Representor No: PRS00210

Representation ID: REP05381 Question Ref: H1

As residents of Churwell, we are writing with regard to the proposed housing development sites within our local community. We all share the boundary of one of the sites in question, Site 1220A 'Land East of Churwell', and are particularly concerned over any possible proposal to build in this location.

We understand this is currently classified as 'Amber: Sites which have potential but issues / not as favoured as green sites'.

As clearly some of the issues have already been identified, we would like to re-iterate and clarify some of the issues that are of greatest concern to us as residents immediately neighbouring this location.

Churwell Hill / Elland Road is the main road from Morley towards Leeds, and as such suffers from a very high volume of traffic, particularly at commuting hours, when the traffic is at standstill to and from the Ring Road. This road does not have the ability to cope with greater volumes of traffic passing through the area, without creating greater risks to safety (cyclists, pedestrians, drivers) and increased congestion. This has already been identified as an issue as there are a number of speed cameras within a short space along this road.

This particular site, lies next to a busy train line, again posing dangers to locals, as it is not unusual for us to see people walking next to or crossing over the train line. This risk would only increase with additional housing in the area. Additionally, we understand the site has been identified as a historical land-fill area, again highlighting unsuitability.

Regarding the 6 sites identified in Churwell overall, the general infrastructure within the village is not of a scale that could accommodate such volumes of new houses, schools, doctors, dentists, and services in general would not be able to take on a new influx of residents.

Based on these, and other points, we strongly support the re-classification of this area (Site 1220A), and the other proposed Churwell sites, to colour code 'Red: Sites not considered suitable for allocation of housing'. Instead, we would ask the Planning Department to look at the areas within Leeds City Council that already have planning permission, and also, to revitalise housing currently standing empty, rather than look to build on Greenfield areas.

Name: S Smith

Representor No: PRS00272

Representation ID: REP00913 Question Ref: H1

Too much traffic and not any open spaces for children to play. Over built area already. Schools, doctors etc full.

Name: Hannah Gill

Representor No: PRS00278

Representation ID: REP02219 Question Ref: H1

Lack of infrastructure I.E poor road capacity, no school places and this is valued as public open space/green belt.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Joanna Coultous & Stephen Seale

Representor No: PRS00289

Representation ID: REP02230 Question Ref: H1

1282I am writing to voice my objection to Leeds City Councils LDF Site allocation plans in Churwell.

I have lived in Churwell since August 2000. We moved here because we were impressed by the green spaces around and the woodland area which surrounds our home. We also access Pit Hill for walking and the fantastic views across Leeds. During the Autumn there is a community bonfire which is attended by many of the local people. In winter and snowy weather it is used for sledging and again an opportunity for the local people to have recreational enjoyment.

Despite what the farmer who owns the land says it has only been ploughed twice since I have lived here. Once was just before the application for Village green status! It has always been an open space for people to enjoy. It would be a tragedy for it to be built on not only because of the impact on local people and the loss of yet another green area but the devastating impact on traffic along Churwell Hill.

Anyone who uses Churwell Hill on a daily basis to get to work has a constant battle and sometimes the traffic is backed up to the top of Westwoodside. The building of the 'New Village' has added to the chaos and that project should be a warning to planners of the negative impact thoughtless building has on a community. The road itself is breaking up under the pressure of the traffic. Heavy plant and construction would cause further inconvenience to motorists at peak times. It is to my mind, a vision of hell.

Whilst living in Churwell I have been unable to access a local dentist as they are all chock a block. I have to travel to Bromley to have my teeth seen to. I have also seen the growth of the local school and the fact that many of my neighbour's children cannot get a place there.

Churwell is a lovely place to live but it appears that due to its very popularity planners see it as an easy target to build on. Surely there are lots of areas around Leeds that could be used or is there some political agenda going on. I am not a NIMBY as I realise that people need homes but there is also a need for open spaces for those people to enjoy.

It would be totally unsustainable if the proposed 1248 were to be built in Churwell. The plans should at least include provision for a new Primary school, High school, medical centre, church and shops as well as creating a way into the Village that does not involve spilling onto Churwell Hill. Without the infra structure it would be untenable.

I hope that sense prevails over profit and these plans are altered or dropped completely. I for one would be happy to take civil action against any of these plans. It seems that there is no real need in this area for this housing and the introduction of at least 5000 people and possibly over 3000 extra cars which would add pollution and overcrowding of already overcrowded amenities. How many people on the planning committee live in Morley or Churwell or would consider moving into these superfluous dwellings? Leave Churwell alone and let us enjoy what remains of the open spaces we have.

It would be a great shame if Churwell Park were to be the only green space left in Churwell.

Yours truly,

Name: M Oddy

Representor No: PRS00297

Representation ID: REP02236 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Green to red. Because Churwell Hill is far too busy, Churwell schools are full to capacity as are schools in Morley. These plans are ridiculous.

Name: Eric And Joyce Todd

Representor No: PRS00300

Representation ID: REP02237 Question Ref: H1

Green to red. Not suited for to many houses planned for area.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Janet Harrison

Representor No: PRS00304

Representation ID: REP02245 Question Ref: H1

Site 1282 - Laneside Farm (suggested capacity 542 houses).

Site 2125 - Manor House Farm (suggested capacity 77 houses).

I WISH THE ABOVE SITES TO BE COLOUR CODED RED

I wish to object to the above plans for the following reasons:-

Traffic Congestion; Elland/Victoria Road which runs the length of Churwell has an enormous amount of traffic during the main rush-hour and now a days during the off peak hours as well. How would building an estimated 1,248 houses, all of which will need to use this road for access, be of anything but disastrous for the local community of Churwell. Surely the extra traffic would bring the Outer Leeds Ring-road to a halt. If you are not of the same opinion please write to me and convince me otherwise.

Schools; Churwell Primary School is 2-form and is full. Local residents are being turned away as it is. The proposed building will be nearer to the school enabling them to gain priority above many of the current local residents. Increasing CPS to 3-form would bring capacity for 360 children. A number that now where near meets the needs of 1,248 houses. Is LCC prepared to build a school with the infrastructure to cope with the influx? Our 3 High Schools are also at capacity. Are you planning on building a new High School as Well?

Doctors & Dentists; There is no dentist in Churwell and only 1 Doctors Surgery. Dentists in Morley are full and most only take new private patients. This is the situation now and if there is no new infrastructure along with the new housing then it will become very difficult in Churwell and Morley to obtain the basic essentials for healthy living.

Access; The roads to the proposed sites are already under pressure of traffic, indeed on some access roads the traffic is reduced to single file because of cars parked outside domestic property. Churwell New Village is appalling re the way car-parking was under calculated by the Developers and approved by Leeds City Council. It is impossible to drive a vehicle along some streets as the roads are congested with parked cars owned by the residents. How is access to be guaranteed to the new housing when it will have to travel on these congested roads?

Loss of Green Space; Site 1282 is the only green-space which separates Churwell from Morley's suburbs. These field are presently farmed and have public footpaths for access into this small bit of countryside. The area is well used by the local residents of Churwell and Morley. It is inconceivable that you wish to remove this asset and merge Churwell into Morley by filling this much appreciated green-space with housing.

Site 2125 was last year the subject of a 'Village Green' application and supported by letters of over 150 local residents in support of this application. These applications came for people who had roamed freely over this land for more than 20 years. There were as many applications submitted by people who had roamed for less than 20 years. If you read the Inspectors report the failure of this application was on a technicality and not because it was found that people had not and do not use this land for recreational purposes. Your proposals will fill this land with unnecessary housing and remove the last remnants of land where our children can get outside and observe the flora and fauna in our local community.

Brownfield Sites; Leeds has enough brownfield sites in which to start building the housing numbers recommended in the LDF. Make the Property Developers use this not the easier and cheaper green spaces they are lobbying hard to use.

Twenty years ago I had the choice to live and work in Leeds or Manchester. I chose Leeds because it had a vision and integrity towards its building plans, leaving spaces between the various localities, which gives a sense of space and a feeling of belonging to an individual area.

Manchester's rambling urban sprawl, where you have no idea what town you are in let a lone what area of Manchester sent a shudder down my spine.

Please, please don't turn Leeds into the same endless urban environment by allowing mass housing to be built on small green-space between the existing local areas. I will not be the only person who, considering where to live will feel Leeds has a unique balance. I know you have to have a vision to improve Leeds. You also have a responsibility not to spoil it for the generations to come.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Wenda P Whitehead

Representor No: PRS00312

Representation ID: REP04786 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Representation ID: REP02254 Question Ref: H1

Referring to the LDF sites in the Morley area I would like to present my objections as follows:-

The Green areas:-

Site 1282 - Laneside Farm (suggested capacity 542 houses).

Site 2125 - Manor House Farm (suggested capacity 77 houses).

Objection to the above because of the situations regarding:-

SCHOOLS - For many years now we have had problems finding places for our children in Morley/Churwell schools. After discussions with the Education Department we did manage to obtain an additional class intake at Asquith School but all other schools are full to capacity with no more room for extra classes or extensions. Can you find money to build new schools or areas to put them?

TRAFFIC — Elland Road is the main road to Leeds from Morley and is already "nose to tail" during the rush hour every day. It is used often by Ambulances, Police, etc. during these periods which does often cause problems it being a narrow road with bends and narrow pavements through a built up area. I personally have had three vehicles into my fence/wall.

FACILITIES — Dentists/Doctors. These facilities already have problems with the local Doctors very often being unable to offer appointments in less than a week.

We are already really worried about the extra problems the Daisy Hill development will cause without adding the unbelievable numbers of housing to an already saturated area.

I sincerely trust you will give the above comments your consideration and look at this matter in a sensible way by transferring ALL OF THESE SITES TO RED.

Representation ID: REP02254 Question Ref: H4

Referring to the LDF sites in the Morley area I would like to present my objections as follows:-

The Green areas:-

Site 1282 - Laneside Farm (suggested capacity 542 houses).

Site 2125 - Manor House Farm (suggested capacity 77 houses).

Objection to the above because of the situations regarding:-

SCHOOLS - For many years now we have had problems finding places for our children in Morley/Churwell schools. After discussions with the Education Department we did manage to obtain an additional class intake at Asquith School but all other schools are full to capacity with no more room for extra classes or extensions. Can you find money to build new schools or areas to put them?

TRAFFIC — Elland Road is the main road to Leeds from Morley and is already "nose to tail" during the rush hour every day. It is used often by Ambulances, Police, etc. during these periods which does often cause problems it being a narrow road with bends and narrow pavements through a built up area. I personally have had three vehicles into my fence/wall.

FACILITIES — Dentists/Doctors. These facilities already have problems with the local Doctors very often being unable to offer appointments in less than a week.

We are already really worried about the extra problems the Daisy Hill development will cause without adding the unbelievable numbers of housing to an already saturated area.

I sincerely trust you will give the above comments your consideration and look at this matter in a sensible way by transferring ALL OF THESE SITES TO RED.

Name: J Beckwith

Representor No: PRS00317

Representation ID: REP02256 Question Ref: H1

Green to red. Churwell is already overcrowded. Increase in traffic, extra burden on schools, local services etc, all are 100% capacity now.

Name: A E Britton

Representor No: PRS00333

Representation ID: REP02265 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Laneside Farm In a green belt.

Increased traffic congestion, loss of open space, loss of Churwell identity.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Rodney Britton

Representor No: PRS00334

Representation ID: REP02261 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Laneside Farm
Green to Red
In Green Belt.
Increased traffic congestion, local schools full, last large green space in Churwell.

Name: C Oliver

Representor No: PRS00358

Representation ID: REP02301 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Laneside Farm
Green to Red
Green Belt, destroy Churwell character, 130 x private brownfield sites in Leeds, thousands of empty homes in Leeds - look at Beeston/Holbeck. 1 million empty homes in Britain - do them up.

Name: G Crossland

Representor No: PRS00360

Representation ID: REP02302 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Laneside Farm, Churwell
Green to Red
To retain Green Belt land and district definitions.
Too many cars from the site - not enough road infrastructure in the area.

Name: Lee Crossland

Representor No: PRS00361

Representation ID: REP02305 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Laneside Farm Churwell
Green to Red
This gives a natural break between Morley and Churwell.
Heavy traffic on Churwell Hill.
Local services already at full capacity and general loss of greenery which does support some wildlife.

Name: Catherine Halloran

Representor No: PRS00364

Representation ID: REP02307 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Laneside Farm, Churwell - change to Red
Not enough school places in Churwell and congestion of traffic would be a major issue.

Name: C Monk

Representor No: PRS00389

Representation ID: REP02329 Question Ref: H1

1282. Green to red. Traffic is horrendous morning and night on Churwell Hill and surrounding areas - queues from Dry Salters all the way up Churwell Hill - more housing is just a joke - no way. Churwell is already like a lego village with houses everywhere. Why do we need even more?

Name: Susan Williams

Representor No: PRS00396

Representation ID: REP02339 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm - Green to Red
Site not considered suitable for additional housing

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Claire Williams

Representor No: PRS00397

Representation ID: REP02340 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm - Green to Red

Site not considered suitable for additional housing. Keep green spaces.

Local infrastructure in Churwell would not support additional housing (schools roads, services)

Name: Lynne Senior

Representor No: PRS00399

Representation ID: REP02343 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Green to red. Green Belt? Already new housing estates around, too much traffic.

Too much traffic around Churwell Hill (dangerous around Churwell School and Cottingley). Not enough doctors/dentists in the Morley area. Morley is getting completely joined up to Leeds (Beeston area). Why not pick North Leeds/Garforth for areas plenty of fields to build on?

Name: David Williams

Representor No: PRS00401

Representation ID: REP02344 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm - Green to Red

Site not considered suitable for new housing. Keep green spaces.

Local infrastructure in Churwell does not support additional housing (schools, roads, services)

Name: Dean Frank

Representor No: PRS00402

Representation ID: REP02347 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm - Green to Red

Site not considered suitable for new housing. Keep green spaces.

Local infrastructure in Churwell does not support additional housing (schools, roads, services)

Name: A Thorpe

Representor No: PRS00409

Representation ID: REP02353 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm - Green to Red

In Green Belt

Site would be served by Elland Road which is too busy and also very dangerous.

Name: T Thorpe

Representor No: PRS00414

Representation ID: REP02356 Question Ref: H1

1282 Lakeside Farm - Green to Red

Green Belt

Access to site via Elland Road which cannot accept any more traffic.

Name: E Bard

Representor No: PRS00419

Representation ID: REP02358 Question Ref: H1

1282. Green to red. High traffic in peak hours.

Name: Benjamin Helm

Representor No: PRS00430

Representation ID: REP02375 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Green to red, reason green belt. Roads and schools can't cope as it is.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Patricia Brown

Representor No: PRS00431

Representation ID: REP02377 Question Ref: H1

1282 - green to red. In green belt. Heavy traffic congestion - Churwell Hill etc. Doctors full as it is. Schools full as it is. Ruination of open green spaces. No place to breathe.

Name: J Thompson

Representor No: PRS00433

Representation ID: REP02378 Question Ref: H1

1282 - green to red. Lack of infrastructure. No schools places for resident children.

Name: Ivy Shelton

Representor No: PRS00435

Representation ID: REP02380 Question Ref: H1

1282 - green to red. Stay green enough housing already. No school places, doctors and dentist full, road full of traffic.

Name: S Ellis

Representor No: PRS00436

Representation ID: REP02381 Question Ref: H1

1282 - green to red. Green belt. Another 500 vehicles using Churwell Hill, which is already very busy between 7.30 and 9.00am.

Name: Shirley Smith

Representor No: PRS00437

Representation ID: REP02383 Question Ref: H1

1282 - change to red. No more houses in Churwell. Roads and schools cannot cope. No doctors no dentist. Take new houses to nort Leeds!

Name: Bessie Jackson

Representor No: PRS00438

Representation ID: REP02382 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Green to red.

Churwell cannot cope with all this building. Our children cannot obtain school places now! Traffic congestion is a problem. Local facilities also a problem - doctors, dentists etc.

Name: Jeff Smith

Representor No: PRS00439

Representation ID: REP02385 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Churwell is a village and should stay a village. We are already up to capacity for schools and doctors. Roads already too busy.

Name: Peter Marshmont

Representor No: PRS00440

Representation ID: REP02384 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Green to red.

What about schools, medical controls, access to and from area.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Janice Beever

Representor No: PRS00441

Representation ID: REP04791 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Representation ID: REP02386 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Doctors, dentist and schools are all working at full capacity with the residents already living in Churwell. The traffic and public transport is extremely busy at peak times. Churwell has already doubled in size over the last few years - with no extra facilities - any further development will destroy the village identity - it's unacceptable.

Name: Deborah Ingham

Representor No: PRS00442

Representation ID: REP02388 Question Ref: H1

1282 - No room in our doctors. No room in our dentists. Not enough places in our school. There is no room for the above for residents who already live in Churwell. There is only one road through Churwell and this is already overflowing and the road is in need of work, more traffic will cause more congestion and damage to the road surface.

Name: Jessica Croft

Representor No: PRS00443

Representation ID: REP02389 Question Ref: H1

1282 - The area will not uphold any more houses and individuals and I believe schools, doctors and roads will be hugely affected.

Name: Paul Haylings

Representor No: PRS00444

Representation ID: REP02391 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Schools are already overcrowded, would make traffic even worse, would drive prices of houses down in the area.

Name: Ian Thomas

Representor No: PRS00445

Representation ID: REP02390 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Green to red.

In Green Belt. Heavy traffic congestion on Churwell Hill. Doctors full up as it is. Schools at full capacity. Ruination of countryside.

Name: Dennis Smith

Representor No: PRS00453

Representation ID: REP02400 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Not enough schools, no policing, not enough doctors, road cannot take more traffic.

Name: William Lee

Representor No: PRS00454

Representation ID: REP02402 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Churwell isn't a village anymore. My back garden looked on to field belonging to a farm. On the plans before building houses my back garden didn't show a gable end facing my garden. Enough is enough.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Freda Lee

Representor No: PRS00455

Representation ID: REP02403 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Churwell has taken too many new houses that we are getting overcrowded. Schools can't cope, doctors can't cope.

Name: Jatinder Singh Mann

Representor No: PRS00457

Representation ID: REP02401 Question Ref: H1

1282 Lakeside Farm - Green to Red

Traffic in Churwell is already at a standstill at rush hour/peak times. It cannot take any more without major problems for locals. This will also affect schooling as my neighbour has had problems obtaining a place at Churwell Primary School for his son - this is a scandal!! hope to start a family in the future and do not wish to as my neighbour has been forced to do.

Name: Garry Tottie

Representor No: PRS00459

Representation ID: REP02407 Question Ref: H1

1282 - green to red.

Name: M Blockley

Representor No: PRS00460

Representation ID: REP02406 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm - Green to Red

Green Belt

Traffic congestion on Churwell Hill. Where would the access road onto Victoria Road be sited?

Name: D P Willerton

Representor No: PRS00468

Representation ID: REP02409 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm - Green to Red

Not enough amenities

Traffic congestion

Over crowding in schools, doctors, etc.

Name: Terence Dawson

Representor No: PRS00471

Representation ID: REP02419 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Green to red.

School and health services at full capacity now. Churwell badly congested now, plus new development at White Rose will intensify this problem in the area.

Name: A Moors

Representor No: PRS00472

Representation ID: REP02421 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Green to red.

In Green Belt area. Require green areas in Churwell. Traffic would feed into Churwell Hill and Ring Road that cannot cope now.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Marjorie Beevers

Representor No: PRS00476

Representation ID: REP02424 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Green to red.

Not enough schools, doctors etc.

Name: I Holdsworth

Representor No: PRS00480

Representation ID: REP02425 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Green to red. Lack of basic essential infrastructure in the area. No school places, doctors/dentists working at full capacity. Traffic congestion. Loss of village character.

Name: J Hudson

Representor No: PRS00484

Representation ID: REP02430 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Green to red. Lack of basic essential infrastructure in the area. No school places, doctors/dentists working at full capacity. Traffic congestion.

Name: Claire Hall

Representor No: PRS00486

Representation ID: REP02434 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Green to red. This is one of the few remaining unspoilt open areas in Churwell. Churwell is already overcrowded - Churwell children struggle to get into Morley schools. Wrong.

Name: Jayne Gelder

Representor No: PRS00489

Representation ID: REP02436 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Green to red. Lack of basic essential infrastructure in the area. Not enough school places, doctors and dentists. Traffic congestion.

Name: C Eastwood

Representor No: PRS00490

Representation ID: REP02438 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Green to red. Schools appear full and also doctors and dentists. Would cause an increase in traffic congestion.

Name: Margaret Bailey

Representor No: PRS00506

Representation ID: REP02453 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm - Green to Red
Leave Green belt land alone - no more houses

Name: Anita Doherty

Representor No: PRS00507

Representation ID: REP02454 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Green to red. Will spoil our rural walks through there, traffic congestion already high at peak times. Currently places of nature , saw lots of cocoons of a black moth with red spots this year. Takes me days to get a doctors appointment!

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Barbara Walker

Representor No: PRS00508

Representation ID: REP02458 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Green to red. Brownfield sites to be used. Our roads, our schools are full.

Name: Billy Commons

Representor No: PRS00509

Representation ID: REP02907 Question Ref: H1

Site 1282/2125 Green to Red
Site1220A/1099A/1099B/1996(assume 1096) Amber to Red

No School Places
Traffic going to be grid locked
No room in doctors or dentists

Representation ID: REP02456 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm - Green to Red
Schools full, heavy traffic congestion at peak times

Name: Nancy Cockerham

Representor No: PRS00511

Representation ID: REP02459 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Green to red. No more building on green space. Traffic is horrendous. Schools full.

Name: Heather Moynihan

Representor No: PRS00513

Representation ID: REP02462 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Green to red.

No more houses in Churwell!

- 1) Churwell has already over a sustained period of time undergone a major development in the building of houses. The infrastructure in the area cannot cope with any more.
- 2) I have lived in Morley all my life and we know that school places are already at a premium and as a we still only have the same 3 senior schools that were here 45 years ago when I started.
- 3) Churwell Hill is extremely busy and will only get busier if further homes are built and become more dangerous.
- 4) Doctors and dentists will not be able to cope.
- 5) Is Morley to be totally devoid of any green, recreational land for people to enjoy?
- 6) What about North Leeds being used for the building of more houses!!

Name: Karen Smith

Representor No: PRS00514

Representation ID: REP02460 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm - Green to Red
Traffic too busy as it is. Cannot cope with influx of more housing. Need some land without housing for good of the environment and well being of residents.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: D Telford

Representor No: PRS00517

Representation ID: REP02466 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Green to red.

Infrastructure cannot take all these extra houses. Schools cannot take the children now! Traffic is congested already. Lack of facilities - i.e. doctor, dentists etc.

Name: T Holroyd

Representor No: PRS00518

Representation ID: REP02468 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Green to red. It should just stay Green Belt. Like most new houses, they are not bought by new buyers, they are bought to rent and are charging people extortionate amounts of money to rent them.

Name: Abdul Danesh

Representor No: PRS00519

Representation ID: REP02465 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Green to Red. There is a lot of rubbish always on the side on the pavements and in the sides of the streets with pavements. Buses are always dirty. A lot of rubbish there is always in the buses. The people in Leeds and Morley are careless. They throw rubbish everywhere - pavements - streets and in buses.

Name: R Cowling

Representor No: PRS00522

Representation ID: REP02472 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Green to red. Exit from the site into a main road. There is already an exit opposite this site with restricted view of traffic coming up from Churwell.

Name: Derek Metcalf

Representor No: PRS00523

Representation ID: REP02387 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Green to red.

Schools already full - dentists and doctors full. Traffic congestion already a problem, many houses in area still for sale.

Name: Adele Metcalf

Representor No: PRS00525

Representation ID: REP02392 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Green to red. Schools already full, dentists and doctors full. Traffic congestion already a problem, many houses in area still for sale.

Name: Roy Duckworth

Representor No: PRS00571

Representation ID: REP02529 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm - Green to Red
Green Belt. It would be an utter disaster to build here. The traffic on Churwell Hill is an utter nightmare now, so what do you think it will be like with 542 houses. Typical labour - no idea

Name: Ronnie Hall

Representor No: PRS00572

Representation ID: REP02528 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm - Green to Red
Green Belt. It would be an utter disaster to build here. The traffic on Churwell Hill is an utter nightmare now, so what do you think it will be like with 542 houses. Typical labour - no idea

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Connie Lunn

Representor No: PRS00573

Representation ID: REP02530 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm - Green to Red
2125 Manor House Farm - Green to Red
1220A, 1099A, 1099B, 1096 (Assumed - 1996 on form) - Amber to Red
School cannot accommodate more children, traffic already congested during peak hours, lack of local facilities (doctors, dentists).

Name: June Munday

Representor No: PRS00574

Representation ID: REP02531 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm - Green to Red
Area has poor road coverage. Churwell Hill cannot be widened. Not enough Doctors, Schools, etc.

Name: J Telford

Representor No: PRS00575

Representation ID: REP02532 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm - Green to Red
2125 Manor House Farm - Green to Red
1220A, 1099A, 1099B, 1096 (Assumed - 1996 on form) - Amber to Red
No School places, traffic congestion, infrastructure. Lack of doctors and dentists who are already full.

Name: Brian Georgehow

Representor No: PRS00576

Representation ID: REP02533 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm - Green to Red
Churwell is already overloaded - doctors, schools, dentists, etc.

Name: Eric Newton

Representor No: PRS00577

Representation ID: REP05334 Question Ref: H1

As residents of Churwell, we are writing with regard to the proposed housing development sites within our local community. We all share the boundary of one of the sites in question, Site 1220A 'Land East of Churwell', and are particularly concerned over any possible proposal to build in this location. We understand this is currently classified as 'Amber: Sites which have potential but issues / not as favoured as green sites'. As clearly some of the issues have already been identified, we would like to re-iterate and clarify some of the issues that are of greatest concern to us as residents immediately neighbouring this location. Churwell Hill / Elland Road is the main road from Morley towards Leeds, and as such suffers from a very high volume of traffic, particularly at commuting hours, when the traffic is at standstill to and from the Ring Road. This road does not have the ability to cope with greater volumes of traffic passing through the area, without creating greater risks to safety (cyclists, pedestrians, drivers) and increased congestion. This has already been identified as an issue as there are a number of speed cameras within a short space along this road. This particular site, lies next to a busy train line, again posing dangers to locals, as it is not unusual for us to see people walking next to or crossing over the train line. This risk would only increase with additional housing in the area. Additionally, we understand the site has been identified as a historical land-fill area, again highlighting unsuitability. Regarding the 6 sites identified in Churwell overall, the general infrastructure within the village is not of a scale that could accommodate such volumes of new houses, schools, doctors, dentists, and services in general would not be able to take on a new influx of residents. Based on these, and other points, we strongly support the re-classification of this area (Site 1220A), and the other proposed Churwell sites, to colour code 'Red: Sites not considered suitable for allocation of housing'. Instead, we would ask the Planning Department to look at the areas within Leeds City Council that already have planning permission, and also, to revitalise housing currently standing empty, rather than look to build on Greenfield areas.

Name: Josephine M Barton

Representor No: PRS00578

Representation ID: REP02535 Question Ref: H1

Extra Housing is illogical in this area and already many houses for sale and brown site areas to fill. Schools full and local facilities would be a problem - doctors - dentists - etc.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Jim Miller

Representor No: PRS00579

Representation ID: REP02537 Question Ref: H1

1282. Lane Side Farm. Green to Red.

New site better suited.

Takes its toll on whole infrastructure of Churwell village, not enough places in schools, doctors, plus excess traffic.

Name: Carol Lynne Weldon

Representor No: PRS00596

Representation ID: REP02579 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm. Green to Red.

Farming land should be kept as farming. Far too many houses proposed. Current sewage/drainage not adequate. Flooding.

Name: L A Smith

Representor No: PRS00655

Representation ID: REP02642 Question Ref: H1

1282. Laneside Farm. Red.

Brownfield sites used before farmland. Cars are a bane of our life, whatever built it will be 2-3 cars per house.

Name: Neil Sheard

Representor No: PRS00656

Representation ID: REP02643 Question Ref: H1

1282. Laneside Farm Victoria Road Morley. Green to Amber.

In Green Belt. Used for farming, old coalmine on this land, electric overhead cables and pylons, unknown if this can effect health.

Name: Linda Georgeson

Representor No: PRS00657

Representation ID: REP02644 Question Ref: H1

1282. Laneside Farm.

Churwell Hill is already a very busy road especially at peak times - cannot take much more - and cannot be widened

Name: Philip Jackson

Representor No: PRS00690

Representation ID: REP02685 Question Ref: H1

1282- Change suggested Red, Back to green belt not enough schools etc infrastructure not in place.

Name: Ward

Representor No: PRS00709

Representation ID: REP02711 Question Ref: H4

1282 / 2125 – Change to red for the following reasons:

- The increase in traffic in the area – many on Churwell Hill, has already increased from the opening of Tesco.
- The increase in children trying to find a school nearby. It was bad enough 15 years ago when we had to find alternative schools.
- Living in the middle of an over populated area – estate after estate, after estate – causing an increase in crime
- How long will be waiting for doctors / dentists etc
- Massive traffic increase – since Churwell new village, Churwell is a traffic jam now instead of what it was – a quiet village.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Trevor Wilson

Representor No: PRS00711

Representation ID: REP02713 Question Ref: H1

1282 / 2125 – Change to red for the following reasons:

Too much congestion in this area already, both from housing and transport and not enough school places for children already in the Churwell area.

Name: Nicholas Turton

Representor No: PRS00714

Representation ID: REP02717 Question Ref: H1

1282 / 2125 - Change to red for the following reasons:

- Schools have only room to take children already living in the area.
- Doctors and dentists are at full capacity.
- Heavy traffic congestion at peak times.
- Churwell will become completely joined to Morley and loose village character.

Name: Hazel Holdsworth

Representor No: PRS00848

Representation ID: REP02864 Question Ref: H1

Site 1282/2125 Green to Red

Site1220A/1099A/1099B/1996(assume 1096)

Schools full

No dentist

No doctors. Have to go to Beeston

Poor Bus Service

Need More Crossings

Name: E Johnson

Representor No: PRS00849

Representation ID: REP02865 Question Ref: H1

Site 1282/2125 Green to Red

Site1220A/1099A/1099B/1996(assume 1096) Amber to Red

No schools for children - No doctors or dentists. Too much traffic on Elland Road - Cannot get across for traffic.

Name: Andrea Clarkson

Representor No: PRS00850

Representation ID: REP02866 Question Ref: H1

Site 1282/2125 Green to Red

Site1220A/1099A/1099B/1996(assume 1096) Amber to Red

The traffic is bad enough already. No school places for local children would need more school. Doctors appointments or should I say getting one is hard enough already.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: A C E Lister

Representor No: PRS00851

Representation ID: REP08303 Question Ref: H1

1282 / 2125 -

I wish to object to the above plans for the following reasons:-

Do the members of the Leeds City Planning Dept. actually care about the people who live in or around the sites they plan to develop, or do they only see increased council tax revenues. If they lived in the areas affected by the above proposals they would certainly think again.

The plan to also build several hundred houses on Daisy Hill will cause many traffic problems at the top of King George Ave, Croft House Road, and New Bank Street. These roads all come out onto Elland Road or roads connecting at the top of Churwell Hill. From St Peters Church all the way to Churwell to the roundabout near the Dry Salter's Arms it is one long traffic jam every morning and every evening. It takes at least 30-45 mins to cover 1 1/2 miles and then another 30-45 mins to actually get into Leeds. Throughout the day Elland Road up through Churwell is a busy road.

Upwards of 1500 houses are planned on all sites, on today's average of 1.5 cars per household that will mean another 2250 cars from King George Ave, Sandmead Close, Westwood Side, Harwell Ave, and New Village Way all coming out onto Elland Road in the Churwell area. Elland Road can't cope with the present traffic, without this increased volume. Or have the planners requested that the developers put new roads in these areas so traffic is diverted away from Elland Road.

Also what about the basic infrastructure of the area schools, shops, community centres, environmental issues etc. have any of these been looked at? Or do the planners only see £ signs, over the past 40 years Churwell/Morley has had more than its share of house building, and it's about time Leeds Council looked elsewhere to raise money.

Sincerely trust you will give the above comments your consideration and look at this matter in a sensible way by transferring ALL OF THESE SITES TO RED.

Representation ID: REP02867 Question Ref: H4

1282 / 2125 -

Re: LDF SITES IN MORLEY

The Green areas:-

Site 1282 - Laneside Farm (suggested capacity 542 houses).

Site 2125- Manor House Farm (Pit Hill & Allotments)(suggested capacity 77 houses).

I wish to object to the above plans for the following reasons:-

Do the members of the Leeds City Planning Dept. actually care about the people who live in or around the sites they plan to develop, or do they only see increased council tax revenues. If they lived in the areas affected by the above proposals they would certainly think again.

The plan to also build several hundred houses on Daisy Hill will cause many traffic problems at the top of King George Ave, Croft House Road, and New Bank Street. These roads all come out onto Elland Road or roads connecting at the top of Churwell Hill. From St Peters Church all the way to Churwell to the roundabout near the Dry Salter's Arms it is one long traffic jam every morning and every evening. It takes at least 30-45 mins to cover 1 1/2 miles and then another 30-45 mins to actually get into Leeds. Throughout the day Elland Road up through Churwell is a busy road.

Upwards of 1500 houses are planned on all sites, on today's average of 1.5 cars per household that will mean another 2250 cars from King George Ave, Sandmead Close, Westwood Side, Harwell Ave, and New Village Way all coming out onto Elland Road in the Churwell area. Elland Road can't cope with the present traffic, without this increased volume. Or have the planners requested that the developers put new roads in these areas so traffic is diverted away from Elland Road.

Also what about the basic infrastructure of the area schools, shops, community centres, environmental issues etc. have any of these been looked at? Or do the planners only see £ signs, over the past 40 years Churwell/Morley has had more than its share of house building, and it's about time Leeds Council looked elsewhere to raise money.

Sincerely trust you will give the above comments your consideration and look at this matter in a sensible way by transferring ALL OF THESE SITES TO RED.

Name: Betty Wilson

Representor No: PRS00855

Representation ID: REP02871 Question Ref: H1

Sites 1282 and 2125

I would like the above changed to red. I wish to object to the LDF plans for the following reasons: Too much congestion in this area both for housing and transport and not enough school spaces for children already in the Churwell area.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Tiffany Sturdy

Representor No: PRS00857

Representation ID: REP02873 Question Ref: H1

There is a limited amount of school placements and childcare in the area and most are running to their full capacity. Doctors and dentists are also limited on new patients. There is already heavy traffic congestion at peak times and more homes would add to this problem. These developments would reduce the already limited amount of outdoor open areas available to residents.

Name: Paul Kirk

Representor No: PRS00884

Representation ID: REP02905 Question Ref: H1

Site 1282/2125 Green to Red
Site1220A/1099A/1099B/1996(assume 1096) Amber to Red

The traffic already horrendous on Churwell hill and there is a waiting list for the dentist. There has been a lot of building in this area with the addition of Churwell New Village and the area is bursting at the seams.

Name: Margery Kirk

Representor No: PRS00885

Representation ID: REP02906 Question Ref: H1

Site 1282/2125 Green to Red
Site1220A/1099A/1099B/1996(assume 1096) Amber to Red

It would alter the whole infrastructure. The traffic congestion is already a nightmare on Churwell Hill and Elland Road. The schools are full to capacity. Local children can't all get into the schools. Drs surgeries are full. You've all on to get an appointment. The waste collections will struggle to keep up regularity. The whole idea of Dore New Buildings in this area is totally ludicrous. THINK AGAIN. It will lose its village character.

Name: Lynne Bedford

Representor No: PRS00887

Representation ID: REP02908 Question Ref: H1

Site 1282/2125 Green to Red
Site1220A/1099A/1099B/1996(assume 1096) Amber to Red

We already have no school places for children actually living in Churwell. Plus the road congestion since New Village was built has doubled and there are more houses being built on Daisy Hill.

Name: Anthony Holmes

Representor No: PRS00889

Representation ID: REP02910 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Lane side Farm, Green to Red, Green Field site. Usually 2 per house so 1000+ cars on Churwell Hill plus pollution.

Name: Marie Henderson

Representor No: PRS00890

Representation ID: REP03304 Question Ref: H1

1282

Name: H.j Bilton

Representor No: PRS00904

Representation ID: REP02933 Question Ref: H1

1282 / 2125 - Amber to Red, Schools have only room to take children already living in the area no spare capacity. Churwell Hill (Elland Road) is the only road into Leeds and afraid heavy traffic at peaktimes will make getting onto Elland Road impossible. Churwell will become joined up to Morley and will lose its long held village character. Doctors and Dentists working at full capacity. Infrastructure not sufficient for so many new houses to be built.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: John Bilton

Representor No: PRS00907

Representation ID: REP02934 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Laneside farm

1)Infrastructure not sufficient for so many hous. 2) Schools are full and have no spare capac. 3) Elland Road struggles to cope at peak times now & with more houses would be impossible. 4) With more housing Churwell would join up with Morley and loose its village character. 5)Doctors & Dentists already full capacity.

Name: Elaine Fletcher

Representor No: PRS00913

Representation ID: REP02942 Question Ref: H1

1282

Name: P S Barrie

Representor No: PRS00915

Representation ID: REP04781 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Representation ID: REP04810 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Representation ID: REP04769 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: A P O'Brien

Representor No: PRS01057

Representation ID: REP03117 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Churwell - Green to Red

I feel that this should stay as Green Belt so that farming on this land can be maintained. If properties were to be built it would already overload the existing road infrastructure which is running at over capacity now, and cause further damage to already poor road infrastructure.

Name: A.j. Ellis

Representor No: PRS01080

Representation ID: REP03145 Question Ref: H1

Site 1282/2125 Green to Red

Site1220A/1099A/1099B/1996(assume 1096) Amber to Red

1/ Roads alrady congested

2/Insufficient school places

3/Medical services already at full capacity

4/The traffic pollution on Churwell Hill between 7:30 and 9:00am is very bad.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Lynne Paul

Representor No: PRS01169

Representation ID: REP04800 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Representation ID: REP05297 Question Ref: H1

Land Side Farm 1282. Keep Red.

This land has been designated for building, but has a change of levels from road to site of at least 3 meters, which would make access difficult. Adjoining housing estates already have badly congested roads and would not be able to take traffic from such a large site. This site is prime farm land and should be protected for the production of food. It seems short sighted for a island country to rely entirely on food imports. Perhaps people would complain less about future developments if new housing stock was spread more evenly around the city, and if developers were made to use brown field sites first. Maybe imposing a levy from building on green sites would help.

Name: Angela Horsfall

Representor No: PRS01174

Representation ID: REP03272 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Laneside Farm. Green to Red. This area is already oversubscribed in comparison to the service available. Congestion on local roads, no places for our children in the nearest schools, doctors and dentist surgeries!!!

Name: P Britland

Representor No: PRS01176

Representation ID: REP03274 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Churwell. Green to Red. Infrastructure, Dentists, Schools, Roads Heavy Traffic, Schools, Doctors, Dentists already full.

Name: K Fielden

Representor No: PRS01179

Representation ID: REP03278 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Churwell. Green to Red. Roads infrastructures, schools, dentists. Roads congested. Trains full (I am a regular passenger on trains for work). HORRENDOUS!!!

Name: D Paul

Representor No: PRS01183

Representation ID: REP04793 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Audrey Hippey

Representor No: PRS01200

Representation ID: REP03298 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Lane side Fram

Name: David Woods

Representor No: PRS01201

Representation ID: REP03300 Question Ref: H1

1282 Green to Red.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: K Fryer

Representor No: PRS01445

Representation ID: REP03576 Question Ref: H1

1282 green to red. Schools not big enough. Too much traffic. No wildlife and open space left.

Name: John Hallagan

Representor No: PRS01455

Representation ID: REP03588 Question Ref: H1

1282 – green to red. The only green belt between Churwell and Morley. A breathtaking view (at the moment).

Name: Katherine Davies

Representor No: PRS01514

Representation ID: REP05332 Question Ref: H1

As residents of Churwell, we are writing with regard to the proposed housing development sites within our local community.

We all share the boundary of one of the sites in question, Site 1220A 'Land East of Churwell', and are particularly concerned over any possible proposal to build in this location.

We understand this is currently classified as 'Amber: Sites which have potential but issues / not as favoured as green sites'.

As clearly some of the issues have already been identified, we would like to re-iterate and clarify some of the issues that are of greatest concern to us as residents immediately neighbouring this location.

Churwell Hill / Elland Road is the main road from Morley towards Leeds, and as such suffers from a very high volume of traffic, particularly at commuting hours, when the traffic is at standstill to and from the Ring Road. This road does not have the ability to cope with greater volumes of traffic passing through the area, without creating greater risks to safety (cyclists, pedestrians, drivers) and increased congestion. This has already been identified as an issue as there are a number of speed cameras within a short space along this road.

This particular site, lies next to a busy train line, again posing dangers to locals, as it is not unusual for us to see people walking next to or crossing over the train line. This risk would only increase with additional housing in the area. Additionally, we understand the site has been identified as a historical land-fill area, again highlighting unsuitability.

Regarding the 6 sites identified in Churwell overall, the general infrastructure within the village is not of a scale that could accommodate such volumes of new houses, schools, doctors, dentists, and services in general would not be able to take on a new influx of residents.

Based on these, and other points, we strongly support the re-classification of this area (Site 1220A), and the other proposed Churwell sites, to colour code 'Red: Sites not considered suitable for allocation of housing'. Instead, we would ask the Planning Department to look at the areas within Leeds City Council that already have planning permission, and also, to revitalise housing currently standing empty, rather than look to build on Greenfield areas.

Name: Nora Ellis

Representor No: PRS01517

Representation ID: REP03659 Question Ref: H1

1282 Churwell Green to Red. Dentists, schools all full. Roads blocked, threat of ambulances not able to get through, infrastructure on overload

Name: Sarah Kate Linden

Representor No: PRS01524

Representation ID: REP03663 Question Ref: H1

1282 Green to Red. Schools dentists, roads infrastructure, roads congested can't access hospitals etc schools full doctor's dentists full.

Name: Wilfred Parker

Representor No: PRS01527

Representation ID: REP03668 Question Ref: H1

1282 Churwell Green to Red. Very congested area already, schools, dentists etc. Roads almost impassable.

Name: I Stephens

Representor No: PRS01545

Representation ID: REP03686 Question Ref: H1

1282

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Kenneth Linley

Representor No: PRS01550

Representation ID: REP03693 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Laneside Farm Green to Red The school is already oversubscribed and some Churwell children cannot get places in Churwell School. There is only one GP sub-surgery for the whole of Churwell and already hundreds of houses have been built here in the last few years this has also impacted on the volume of traffic going to and from Leeds. The existing main road cannot cope with this high volume now.

Name: Keith Wahelin

Representor No: PRS01557

Representation ID: REP03700 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Laneside Farm Green to Red. Too much traffic, schools not big enough, wildlife & open space.

Name: J.k Maybury

Representor No: PRS01585

Representation ID: REP03736 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm Green to Red. Serious traffic congestion at peak times. Need to preserve some green space at Churwell side of ring road habitat for wild life. Loss of vegetation adds to pollution.

Name: P Gaughan

Representor No: PRS01590

Representation ID: REP03738 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm Green to Red. Heavy traffic already, no spare school places would need more health services.

Name: Jane Bellwood

Representor No: PRS01593

Representation ID: REP03745 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm Green to Red. Heavy traffic on Churwell Hill especially at peak times. Doctors & Dentist & schools are at full capacity. These will be hardly any green areas left in the area for people to enjoy.

Representation ID: REP08302 Question Ref: H4

1282 / 2125 -

I wish to object to the above plans for the following reasons:-

Some of the sites are on green belt land such as 1282— Laneside Farm. I think it is important to preserve some green spaces locally as once they are built on, they will be lost forever!

The 1282 Laneside Farm and 2125 Manor House Farm sites in particular separate Churwell from Morley which helps Churwell retain its village character. The same can be said for all sites as they are all bordering Churwell.

Local Schools cannot cope with the number of children currently enrolling into them. My son started Churwell School in 2012 at which there were 85 applicants for only 60 places in the reception year. Some Churwell children were allocated places outside the area in Beeston, etc. Other Schools in Morley similarly had greater numbers of applications than places resulting in an extra class having to be run in Asquith School, Morley. The numbers of houses proposed for the area will obviously mean that there would be a huge increase in children in the area which will affect both primary and high schools. Local councillors/MPs are campaigning for Churwell children to be offered places at Churwell Schools and also Morley children to be offered a place at a Morley school where it has been requested.

Doctors and dentists are at capacity currently.

Such a massive development will have an impact on the roads. It is now 'the norm' for traffic to queue out of Churwell towards the ring road on a morning and for a slow crawl of traffic back up through Churwell in the evening rush hour. Not only would extra traffic inconvenience road users further, but I think pollution increases should be looked into too.

Finally, I am aware that these developments have been publicised and that there is a lot of local opposition to them. Please remember that the council is run to represent the community and allowing unsustainable levels of house building such as these is against the vast majority of the public's wishes. I would suggest visiting Churwell to conduct a survey to assess opinion of the public. Please side with the Leeds communities rather than the national house builders.

I sincerely trust you will give the above comments your consideration and look at this matter in a sensible way by transferring ALL OF THESE SITES TO RED.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Simon Walker

Representor No: PRS01602

Representation ID: REP03751 Question Ref: H1

1282 Lane side farm Green to Red. Heavy peak time traffic on Churwell Hill, medical facilities & schools are at full capacity and this will obliterate all the green spaces for people & wildlife to enjoy.

Representation ID: REP03751 Question Ref: H4

1220A Land East of Churwell Amber to Red. Heavy peak time traffic on Churwell Hill, medical facilities & schools are at full capacity and this will obliterate all the green spaces for people & wildlife to enjoy.

Name: B Stringer

Representor No: PRS01606

Representation ID: REP04797 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North
Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Representation ID: REP03758 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm Churwell Green to Red. Lack of infrastructure in area more traffic congestion no school places, doctors, dentists, all working at full capacity.

Name: L.e Beever

Representor No: PRS01607

Representation ID: REP04804 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North
Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Representation ID: REP03759 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside farm Churwell. Green to Red. Lack of basic essential infrastructure in the area. No school places, Dr's/Dentists working at full capacity, traffic congestion, loss of village character.

Name: Paula Pearce

Representor No: PRS01609

Representation ID: REP03761 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside farm. Churwell school already full Doctors Medical Centres Full, heavy traffic congestion.

Name: Jennie Megson

Representor No: PRS01610

Representation ID: REP03762 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm Green to Red - Increase in traffic on surrounding roads/no space at local schools for increase in children and for Churwells population.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Colin McNab

Representor No: PRS01920

Representation ID: REP08301 Question Ref: H1

1282 / 2125 -

I wish to object to the above plans for the following reasons:-

The above areas represent a green area that provides access to the Countryside in Urban Morley, Churwell New Village and Churwell.

Observation of bats, kingfisher, ducks and swifts. Much is made of supposed plentiful green sites but when we take away local green space, we can't get it back.

Proposed housing would require heavy vehicle traffic to gain access. Since New Village Way has a preponderance of town houses and flats, many cars are parked on both sides of the road, limiting access via this route. It is also relevant that children play on this and adjoining streets, making the addition of Heavy vehicle through traffic an increased hazard.

The overgrown fields which lead up to Pit Hill and the ground between the hill and the motorway have been grazed by tethered horses and ponies, since fixed by chain and tyres or stakes would indicate use by the travelling community.

The only other use for the land has been by local people walking dogs, sledging on the hill and children using the land for 'adventure'.

The areas house market has suffered greatly following the crash in the housing market in 2007. Persimmon sold property up to a value of 195000 and house prices have fallen to 151000 in the space of 6 years. Further house stock in this area would further devalue existing housing prices.

It was stated by Persimmon when specifically asked if any further construction was envisaged, which would detract from the current views and house prices, that no further construction was likely due to the presence of the existing farm and poor drainage of the land below it.

Poor drainage and the presence of a storm culvert through Churwell New Village would raise concerns about the risk of flooding due to an increase of housing in that area.

No one wants to see further development in their own area, myself included. I am surprised by the imbalance of the planned housing development which appears to be focussed on the South side of Leeds. Why is Morley so heavily placed in the current plan. As I understand over the last two decades there has been a heavy burden placed on South Leeds with a minor role for North Leeds. This current plan further adds to that burden. It is very important that a Balance is seen to be shown in Housing Planning in all areas of Leeds.

Sincerely trust you will give the above comments your consideration and look at this matter in a sensible way by transferring ALL OF THESE SITES TO RED.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Colin McNab

Representor No: PRS01920

Representation ID: REP04167 Question Ref: H1

Re: LDF SITES IN MORLEY

The Green areas:-

Site 1282 - Laneside Farm (suggested capacity 542 houses).

Site 2125 - Manor House Farm (Pit Hill & Allotments)(suggested capacity 77 houses).

I wish to object to the above plans for the following reasons:-

The above areas represent a green area that provides access to the Countryside in Urban Morley, Churwell New Village and Churwell.

Observation of bats, kingfisher, ducks and swifts. Much is made of supposed plentiful green sites but when we take away local green space, we can't get it back.

The 2011 Census showed that there were 12000 empty properties in Leeds. I understand from discussions with Local Councillors that there are 21000 existing Planning permissions for houses around Leeds. Should we not make use of the existing empty properties and agreed housing applications before resorting to green areas.

I understand that Builders would prefer to build houses in green areas as the profit for them is greater. However the need for affordable housing and family sized homes would be more valuable to the housing pool. The reduced profits of affordable housing is more fitting in times of austerity. The Leeds City Council is not there to maximise profits for building companies.

The plan shows groups of houses but fails to show the infrastructure required to facilitate this. More school places, more GPs, dentists, parking spaces, roads and jobs. No discussions have occurred between planners and the Highways Agency to determine impact and solution to the added traffic to the road network. Roads are already under strain from the existing traffic.

The Churwell New Village is constantly choked with cars parked on the roads. The plan had houses very closely packed with narrow garages that struggle to fit the average family car. Households don't just have one car and this adds to the existing congestion.

Proposed housing would require heavy vehicle traffic to gain access. Since New Village Way has a preponderance of town houses and flats, many cars are parked on both sides of the road, limiting access via this route. It is also relevant that children play on this and adjoining streets, making the addition of Heavy vehicle through traffic an increased hazard.

The overgrown fields which lead up to Pit Hill and the ground between the hill and the motorway have been grazed by tethered horses and ponies, since fixed by chain and tyres or stakes would indicate use by the travelling community.

The only other use for the land has been by local people walking dogs, sledging on the hill and children using the land for 'adventure'.

The areas house market has suffered greatly following the crash in the housing market in 2007. Persimmon sold property up to a value of 195000 and house prices have fallen to 151000 in the space of 6 years. Further house stock in this area would further devalue existing housing prices.

It was stated by Persimmon when specifically asked if any further construction was envisaged, which would detract from the current views and house prices, that no further construction was likely due to the presence of the existing farm and poor drainage of the land below it.

Poor drainage and the presence of a storm culvert through Churwell New Village would raise concerns about the risk of flooding due to an increase of housing in that area.

No one wants to see further development in their own area, myself included. I am surprised by the imbalance of the planned housing development which appears to be focussed on the South side of Leeds. Why is Morley so heavily placed in the current plan. As I understand over the last two decades there has been a heavy burden placed on South Leeds with a minor role for North Leeds. This current plan further adds to that burden. It is very important that a Balance is seen to be shown in Housing Planning in all areas of Leeds.

I also note concern at the likely high speed train line that is to be routed to Leeds. As it will be from the South and West, Morley would again be faced with the greater disruption.

Sincerely trust you will give the above comments your consideration and look at this matter in a sensible way by transferring ALL OF THESE SITES TO RED.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Colin McNab

Representor No: PRS01920

Representation ID: REP04097 Question Ref: H1

Re: LDF SITES IN MORLEY

The Green areas:-

Site 1282 - Laneside Farm (suggested capacity 542 houses).

Site 2125 - Manor House Farm (Pit Hill & Allotments)(suggested capacity 77 houses).

I wish to object to the above plans for the following reasons:-

The above areas represent a green area that provides access to the Countryside in Urban Morley, Churwell New Village and Churwell.

Observation of bats, kingfisher, ducks and swifts. Much is made of supposed plentiful green sites but when we take away local green space, we can't get it back.

Proposed housing would require heavy vehicle traffic to gain access. Since New Village Way has a preponderance of town houses and flats, many cars are parked on both sides of the road, limiting access via this route. It is also relevant that children play on this and adjoining streets, making the addition of Heavy vehicle through traffic an increased hazard.

The overgrown fields which lead up to Pit Hill and the ground between the hill and the motorway have been grazed by tethered horses and ponies, since fixed by chain and tyres or stakes would indicate use by the travelling community.

The only other use for the land has been by local people walking dogs, sledging on the hill and children using the land for 'adventure'.

The areas house market has suffered greatly following the crash in the housing market in 2007. Persimmon sold property up to a value of 195000 and house prices have fallen to 151000 in the space of 6 years. Further house stock in this area would further devalue existing housing prices.

It was stated by Persimmon when specifically asked if any further construction was envisaged, which would detract from the current views and house prices, that no further construction was likely due to the presence of the existing farm and poor drainage of the land below it.

Poor drainage and the presence of a storm culvert through Churwell New Village would raise concerns about the risk of flooding due to an increase of housing in that area.

No one wants to see further development in their own area, myself included. I am surprised by the imbalance of the planned housing development which appears to be focussed on the South side of Leeds. Why is Morley so heavily placed in the current plan. As I understand over the last two decades there has been a heavy burden placed on South Leeds with a minor role for North Leeds. This current plan further adds to that burden. It is very important that a Balance is seen to be shown in Housing Planning in all areas of Leeds.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Colin McNab

Representor No: PRS01920

Representation ID: REP05685 Question Ref: H1

Re: LDF SITES IN MORLEY

The Green areas:-

Site 1282 - Laneside Farm (suggested capacity 542 houses).

Site 2125 - Manor House Farm (Pit Hill & Allotments)(suggested capacity 77 houses).

The Amber areas:-

Site 1220A - Land east of Churwell in field by the railway bridge (suggested capacity 281 houses).

Site 1099A – Land off Hepworth Avenue by M621 (suggested capacity 261 houses).

Site 1099B – Land off Hepworth Avenue by M621 (suggested capacity 80 houses).

Site 1996 – Snittles Farm, New Village Way (suggested capacity 7 houses).

I wish to object to the above plans for the following reasons:-

The above areas represent a green area that provides access to the Countryside in Urban Morley, Churwell New Village and Churwell.

Observation of bats, kingfisher, ducks and swifts. Much is made of supposed plentiful green sites but when we take away local green space, we can't get it back.

Proposed housing would require heavy vehicle traffic to gain access. Since New Village Way has a preponderance of town houses and flats, many cars are parked on both sides of the road, limiting access via this route. It is also relevant that children play on this and adjoining streets, making the addition of Heavy vehicle through traffic an increased hazard.

The overgrown fields which lead up to Pit Hill and the ground between the hill and the motorway have been grazed by tethered horses and ponies, since fixed by chain and tyres or stakes would indicate use by the travelling community.

The only other use for the land has been by local people walking dogs, sledging on the hill and children using the land for 'adventure'.

The areas house market has suffered greatly following the crash in the housing market in 2007. Persimmon sold property up to a value of 195000 and house prices have fallen to 151000 in the space of 6 years. Further house stock in this area would further devalue existing housing prices. It was stated by Persimmon when specifically asked if any further construction was envisaged, which would detract from the current views and house prices, that no further construction was likely due to the presence of the existing farm and poor drainage of the land below it.

Poor drainage and the presence of a storm culvert through Churwell New Village would raise concerns about the risk of flooding due to an increase of housing in that area.

No one wants to see further development in their own area, myself included. I am surprised by the imbalance of the planned housing development which appears to be focussed on the South side of Leeds. Why is Morley so heavily placed in the current plan. As I understand over the last two decades there has been a heavy burden placed on South Leeds with a minor role for North Leeds. This current plan further adds to that burden. It is very important that a Balance is seen to be shown in Housing Planning in all areas of Leeds.

I also note concern at the likely high speed train line that is to be routed to Leeds. As it will be from the South and West, Morley would again be faced with the greater disruption.

Sincerely trust you will give the above comments your consideration and look at this matter in a sensible way by transferring ALL OF THESE SITES TO RED.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Colin McNab

Representor No: PRS01920

Representation ID: REP07525 Question Ref: General comment

Re: LDF SITES IN MORLEY

The Green areas:-

Site 1282 - Laneside Farm (suggested capacity 542 houses).

Site 2125 - Manor House Farm (Pit Hill & Allotments)(suggested capacity 77 houses).

The Amber areas:-

Site 1220A - Land east of Churwell in field by the railway bridge (suggested capacity 281 houses).

Site 1099A - Land off Hepworth Avenue by M621 (suggested capacity 261 houses).

Site 1099B - Land off Hepworth Avenue by M621 (suggested capacity 80 houses).

Site 1996 - Snittles Farm, New Village Way (suggested capacity 7 houses).

I wish to object to the above plans for the following reasons:-

The above areas represent a green area that provides access to the Countryside in Urban Morley, Churwell New Village and Churwell. Observation of bats, kingfisher, ducks and swifts. Much is made of supposed plentiful green sites but when we take away local green space, we can't get it back.

Proposed housing would require heavy vehicle traffic to gain access. Since New Village Way has a preponderance of town houses and flats, many cars are parked on both sides of the road, limiting access via this route. It is also relevant that children play on this and adjoining streets, making the addition of Heavy vehicle through traffic an increased hazard.

The overgrown fields which lead up to Pit Hill and the ground between the hill and the motorway have been grazed by tethered horses and ponies, since fixed by chain and tyres or stakes would indicate use by the travelling community.

The only other use for the land has been by local people walking dogs, sledging on the hill and children using the land for 'adventure'.

The areas house market has suffered greatly following the crash in the housing market in 2007. Persimmon sold property up to a value of 195000 and house prices have fallen to 151000 in the space of 6 years. Further house stock in this area would further devalue existing housing prices. It was stated by Persimmon when specifically asked if any further construction was envisaged, which would detract from the current views and house prices, that no further construction was likely due to the presence of the existing farm and poor drainage of the land below it.

Poor drainage and the presence of a storm culvert through Churwell New Village would raise concerns about the risk of flooding due to an increase of housing in that area.

No one wants to see further development in their own area, myself included. I am surprised by the imbalance of the planned housing development which appears to be focussed on the South side of Leeds. Why is Morley so heavily placed in the current plan. As I understand over the last two decades there has been a heavy burden placed on South Leeds with a minor role for North Leeds. This current plan further adds to that burden. It is very important that a Balance is seen to be shown in Housing Planning in all areas of Leeds.

I also note concern at the likely high speed train line that is too be routed to Leeds. As it will be from the South and West, Morley would again be faced with the greater disruption.

Name: Patricia May

Representor No: PRS02050

Representation ID: REP04254 Question Ref: H1

1282 / 1281B / 1220A -

I wish to make the following comments regarding :

Leeds LDF Volume2: 10 Outer South West

As with previous strategies a great deal of time and money appears to have gone into producing lengthy documents with plans for future developments. Little forethought, however, seems to have been given to ensuring that the infrastructure to cope with these developments is in place.

I refer specifically to the following residential sites —

Ref. 1282 Lane Side Farm PAS Morley (previously firmly rejected, but the decision reversed by Leeds City Council).

Ref. 1281B Bruntcliffe Road Morley

Ref. 1200A Land off Highfield Drive / Harthill Lane, Gildersome, LS27.

(There are many more. The proposed total target is excessive.)

Development of all these sites would cause massive overload on the area's infrastructure : neither highways, schools, medical and social care facilities could cope.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: J Cowie

Representor No: PRS02227

Representation ID: REP04768 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Susan Holt

Representor No: PRS02289

Representation ID: REP04772 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Dereck Holt

Representor No: PRS02311

Representation ID: REP04766 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Deborah Robinson

Representor No: PRS02324

Representation ID: REP04574 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm

Change from Green to Red. Should use all available brownfield sites first across Leeds. Heavy traffic congestion, infrastructure cannot take more properties, e.g schools, doctors. Churwell will lose its village identity.

Name: Peter Robinson

Representor No: PRS02325

Representation ID: REP04575 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm. Change from Green to Red. Should use all available brownfield sites first across Leeds. Heavy traffic congestion. Infrastructure cannot take more properties. E.g schools, doctors. Churwell will lose its village identity.

Name: Jenni Davenport

Representor No: PRS02330

Representation ID: REP04770 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Frank Raven

Representor No: PRS02339

Representation ID: REP04771 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: E Naylor

Representor No: PRS02363

Representation ID: REP04780 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Kathleen Paver

Representor No: PRS02372

Representation ID: REP04774 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: C Guy

Representor No: PRS02377

Representation ID: REP04767 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: C Clegg

Representor No: PRS02406

Representation ID: REP04663 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Doreen Gill

Representor No: PRS02496

Representation ID: REP04755 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: D Naylor

Representor No: PRS02497

Representation ID: REP04773 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: A Paver

Representor No: PRS02498

Representation ID: REP04775 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: James Bowers

Representor No: PRS02500

Representation ID: REP04777 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Alan Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02501

Representation ID: REP04778 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Vivienne Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02502

Representation ID: REP04779 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Vivian Oxtoby

Representor No: PRS02504

Representation ID: REP04783 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Beryl Hewitt

Representor No: PRS02506

Representation ID: REP04785 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: D A Clegg

Representor No: PRS02507

Representation ID: REP04788 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Pauline Wood

Representor No: PRS02508

Representation ID: REP04790 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Joyce Thompson

Representor No: PRS02510

Representation ID: REP04792 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Patricia Aston

Representor No: PRS02513

Representation ID: REP04796 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: L. G Wilson

Representor No: PRS02515

Representation ID: REP04799 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: S Laurence

Representor No: PRS02517

Representation ID: REP04801 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: C Graham

Representor No: PRS02518

Representation ID: REP04803 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: M Allsop

Representor No: PRS02520

Representation ID: REP04805 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: R Hartill

Representor No: PRS02521

Representation ID: REP04806 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Edith Holmes

Representor No: PRS02522

Representation ID: REP04808 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Harry Holmes

Representor No: PRS02524

Representation ID: REP04811 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Ann Morse

Representor No: PRS02526

Representation ID: REP04813 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: L.r Morse

Representor No: PRS02527

Representation ID: REP04816 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Michael Hartill

Representor No: PRS02556

Representation ID: REP04847 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Jim Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02561

Representation ID: REP04852 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Helen Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02562

Representation ID: REP04855 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Ronald Gill

Representor No: PRS02564

Representation ID: REP04858 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: A.w Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02565

Representation ID: REP04859 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: J Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02566

Representation ID: REP04860 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Norman Dearden

Representor No: PRS02568

Representation ID: REP04857 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm, Site Capacity 542, Ward Morley North

Development of this site would complete the merger of the communities of Morley and Churwell. It is an important green space between the two. Access onto Victoria Road (A643) either from King George Avenue or from some new site entrance is difficult if making the journey to Leeds. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Fiona Doherty

Representor No: PRS02786

Representation ID: REP05330 Question Ref: H1

As residents of Churwell, we are writing with regard to the proposed housing development sites within our local community.

We all share the boundary of one of the sites in question, Site 1220A 'Land East of Churwell', and are particularly concerned over any possible proposal to build in this location.

We understand this is currently classified as 'Amber: Sites which have potential but issues / not as favoured as green sites'.

As clearly some of the issues have already been identified, we would like to re-iterate and clarify some of the issues that are of greatest concern to us as residents immediately neighbouring this location.

Churwell Hill / Elland Road is the main road from Morley towards Leeds, and as such suffers from a very high volume of traffic, particularly at commuting hours, when the traffic is at standstill to and from the Ring Road. This road does not have the ability to cope with greater volumes of traffic passing through the area, without creating greater risks to safety (cyclists, pedestrians, drivers) and increased congestion. This has already been identified as an issue as there are a number of speed cameras within a short space along this road.

This particular site, lies next to a busy train line, again posing dangers to locals, as it is not unusual for us to see people walking next to or crossing over the train line. This risk would only increase with additional housing in the area. Additionally, we understand the site has been identified as a historical land-fill area, again highlighting unsuitability.

Regarding the 6 sites identified in Churwell overall, the general infrastructure within the village is not of a scale that could accommodate such volumes of new houses, schools, doctors, dentists, and services in general would not be able to take on a new influx of residents.

Based on these, and other points, we strongly support the re-classification of this area (Site 1220A), and the other proposed Churwell sites, to colour code 'Red: Sites not considered suitable for allocation of housing'. Instead, we would ask the Planning Department to look at the areas within Leeds City Council that already have planning permission, and also, to revitalise housing currently standing empty, rather than look to build on Greenfield areas.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Lindsay Marshall

Representor No: PRS02789

Representation ID: REP05333 Question Ref: H1

As residents of Churwell, we are writing with regard to the proposed housing development sites within our local community. We all share the boundary of one of the sites in question, Site 1220A 'Land East of Churwell', and are particularly concerned over any possible proposal to build in this location.

We understand this is currently classified as 'Amber: Sites which have potential but issues / not as favoured as green sites'.

As clearly some of the issues have already been identified, we would like to re-iterate and clarify some of the issues that are of greatest concern to us as residents immediately neighbouring this location.

Churwell Hill / Elland Road is the main road from Morley towards Leeds, and as such suffers from a very high volume of traffic, particularly at commuting hours, when the traffic is at standstill to and from the Ring Road. This road does not have the ability to cope with greater volumes of traffic passing through the area, without creating greater risks to safety (cyclists, pedestrians, drivers) and increased congestion. This has already been identified as an issue as there are a number of speed cameras within a short space along this road.

This particular site, lies next to a busy train line, again posing dangers to locals, as it is not unusual for us to see people walking next to or crossing over the train line. This risk would only increase with additional housing in the area. Additionally, we understand the site has been identified as a historical land-fill area, again highlighting unsuitability.

Regarding the 6 sites identified in Churwell overall, the general infrastructure within the village is not of a scale that could accommodate such volumes of new houses, schools, doctors, dentists, and services in general would not be able to take on a new influx of residents.

Based on these, and other points, we strongly support the re-classification of this area (Site 1220A), and the other proposed Churwell sites, to colour code 'Red: Sites not considered suitable for allocation of housing'. Instead, we would ask the Planning Department to look at the areas within Leeds City Council that already have planning permission, and also, to revitalise housing currently standing empty, rather than look to build on Greenfield areas.

Name: Sharon Stockdale

Representor No: PRS02791

Representation ID: REP05338 Question Ref: H1

As residents of Churwell, we are writing with regard to the proposed housing development sites within our local community. We all share the boundary of one of the sites in question, Site 1220A 'Land East of Churwell', and are particularly concerned over any possible proposal to build in this location.

We understand this is currently classified as 'Amber: Sites which have potential but issues / not as favoured as green sites'.

As clearly some of the issues have already been identified, we would like to re-iterate and clarify some of the issues that are of greatest concern to us as residents immediately neighbouring this location.

Churwell Hill / Elland Road is the main road from Morley towards Leeds, and as such suffers from a very high volume of traffic, particularly at commuting hours, when the traffic is at standstill to and from the Ring Road. This road does not have the ability to cope with greater volumes of traffic passing through the area, without creating greater risks to safety (cyclists, pedestrians, drivers) and increased congestion. This has already been identified as an issue as there are a number of speed cameras within a short space along this road.

This particular site, lies next to a busy train line, again posing dangers to locals, as it is not unusual for us to see people walking next to or crossing over the train line. This risk would only increase with additional housing in the area. Additionally, we understand the site has been identified as a historical land-fill area, again highlighting unsuitability.

Regarding the 6 sites identified in Churwell overall, the general infrastructure within the village is not of a scale that could accommodate such volumes of new houses, schools, doctors, dentists, and services in general would not be able to take on a new influx of residents.

Based on these, and other points, we strongly support the re-classification of this area (Site 1220A), and the other proposed Churwell sites, to colour code 'Red: Sites not considered suitable for allocation of housing'. Instead, we would ask the Planning Department to look at the areas within Leeds City Council that already have planning permission, and also, to revitalise housing currently standing empty, rather than look to build on Greenfield areas.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: S G Rhode

Representor No: PRS02792

Representation ID: REP05339 Question Ref: H1

As residents of Churwell, we are writing with regard to the proposed housing development sites within our local community. We all share the boundary of one of the sites in question, Site 1220A 'Land East of Churwell', and are particularly concerned over any possible proposal to build in this location.

We understand this is currently classified as 'Amber: Sites which have potential but issues / not as favoured as green sites'.

As clearly some of the issues have already been identified, we would like to re-iterate and clarify some of the issues that are of greatest concern to us as residents immediately neighbouring this location.

Churwell Hill / Elland Road is the main road from Morley towards Leeds, and as such suffers from a very high volume of traffic, particularly at commuting hours, when the traffic is at standstill to and from the Ring Road. This road does not have the ability to cope with greater volumes of traffic passing through the area, without creating greater risks to safety (cyclists, pedestrians, drivers) and increased congestion. This has already been identified as an issue as there are a number of speed cameras within a short space along this road.

This particular site, lies next to a busy train line, again posing dangers to locals, as it is not unusual for us to see people walking next to or crossing over the train line. This risk would only increase with additional housing in the area. Additionally, we understand the site has been identified as a historical land-fill area, again highlighting unsuitability.

Regarding the 6 sites identified in Churwell overall, the general infrastructure within the village is not of a scale that could accommodate such volumes of new houses, schools, doctors, dentists, and services in general would not be able to take on a new influx of residents.

Based on these, and other points, we strongly support the re-classification of this area (Site 1220A), and the other proposed Churwell sites, to colour code 'Red: Sites not considered suitable for allocation of housing'. Instead, we would ask the Planning Department to look at the areas within Leeds City Council that already have planning permission, and also, to revitalise housing currently standing empty, rather than look to build on Greenfield areas.

Name: J Wilde

Representor No: PRS02794

Representation ID: REP05341 Question Ref: H1

As residents of Churwell, we are writing with regard to the proposed housing development sites within our local community. We all share the boundary of one of the sites in question, Site 1220A 'Land East of Churwell', and are particularly concerned over any possible proposal to build in this location.

We understand this is currently classified as 'Amber: Sites which have potential but issues / not as favoured as green sites'.

As clearly some of the issues have already been identified, we would like to re-iterate and clarify some of the issues that are of greatest concern to us as residents immediately neighbouring this location.

Churwell Hill / Elland Road is the main road from Morley towards Leeds, and as such suffers from a very high volume of traffic, particularly at commuting hours, when the traffic is at standstill to and from the Ring Road. This road does not have the ability to cope with greater volumes of traffic passing through the area, without creating greater risks to safety (cyclists, pedestrians, drivers) and increased congestion. This has already been identified as an issue as there are a number of speed cameras within a short space along this road.

This particular site, lies next to a busy train line, again posing dangers to locals, as it is not unusual for us to see people walking next to or crossing over the train line. This risk would only increase with additional housing in the area. Additionally, we understand the site has been identified as a historical land-fill area, again highlighting unsuitability.

Regarding the 6 sites identified in Churwell overall, the general infrastructure within the village is not of a scale that could accommodate such volumes of new houses, schools, doctors, dentists, and services in general would not be able to take on a new influx of residents.

Based on these, and other points, we strongly support the re-classification of this area (Site 1220A), and the other proposed Churwell sites, to colour code 'Red: Sites not considered suitable for allocation of housing'. Instead, we would ask the Planning Department to look at the areas within Leeds City Council that already have planning permission, and also, to revitalise housing currently standing empty, rather than look to build on Greenfield areas.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Z Earnshaw

Representor No: PRS02795

Representation ID: REP05342 Question Ref: H1

As residents of Churwell, we are writing with regard to the proposed housing development sites within our local community. We all share the boundary of one of the sites in question, Site 1220A 'Land East of Churwell', and are particularly concerned over any possible proposal to build in this location.

We understand this is currently classified as 'Amber: Sites which have potential but issues / not as favoured as green sites'.

As clearly some of the issues have already been identified, we would like to re-iterate and clarify some of the issues that are of greatest concern to us as residents immediately neighbouring this location.

Churwell Hill / Elland Road is the main road from Morley towards Leeds, and as such suffers from a very high volume of traffic, particularly at commuting hours, when the traffic is at standstill to and from the Ring Road. This road does not have the ability to cope with greater volumes of traffic passing through the area, without creating greater risks to safety (cyclists, pedestrians, drivers) and increased congestion. This has already been identified as an issue as there are a number of speed cameras within a short space along this road.

This particular site, lies next to a busy train line, again posing dangers to locals, as it is not unusual for us to see people walking next to or crossing over the train line. This risk would only increase with additional housing in the area. Additionally, we understand the site has been identified as a historical land-fill area, again highlighting unsuitability.

Regarding the 6 sites identified in Churwell overall, the general infrastructure within the village is not of a scale that could accommodate such volumes of new houses, schools, doctors, dentists, and services in general would not be able to take on a new influx of residents.

Based on these, and other points, we strongly support the re-classification of this area (Site 1220A), and the other proposed Churwell sites, to colour code 'Red: Sites not considered suitable for allocation of housing'. Instead, we would ask the Planning Department to look at the areas within Leeds City Council that already have planning permission, and also, to revitalise housing currently standing empty, rather than look to build on Greenfield areas.

Name: S Robinson

Representor No: PRS02826

Representation ID: REP05378 Question Ref: H1

As residents of Churwell, we are writing with regard to the proposed housing development sites within our local community. We all share the boundary of one of the sites in question, Site 1220A 'Land East of Churwell', and are particularly concerned over any possible proposal to build in this location.

We understand this is currently classified as 'Amber: Sites which have potential but issues / not as favoured as green sites'.

As clearly some of the issues have already been identified, we would like to re-iterate and clarify some of the issues that are of greatest concern to us as residents immediately neighbouring this location.

Churwell Hill / Elland Road is the main road from Morley towards Leeds, and as such suffers from a very high volume of traffic, particularly at commuting hours, when the traffic is at standstill to and from the Ring Road. This road does not have the ability to cope with greater volumes of traffic passing through the area, without creating greater risks to safety (cyclists, pedestrians, drivers) and increased congestion. This has already been identified as an issue as there are a number of speed cameras within a short space along this road.

This particular site, lies next to a busy train line, again posing dangers to locals, as it is not unusual for us to see people walking next to or crossing over the train line. This risk would only increase with additional housing in the area. Additionally, we understand the site has been identified as a historical land-fill area, again highlighting unsuitability.

Regarding the 6 sites identified in Churwell overall, the general infrastructure within the village is not of a scale that could accommodate such volumes of new houses, schools, doctors, dentists, and services in general would not be able to take on a new influx of residents.

Based on these, and other points, we strongly support the re-classification of this area (Site 1220A), and the other proposed Churwell sites, to colour code 'Red: Sites not considered suitable for allocation of housing'. Instead, we would ask the Planning Department to look at the areas within Leeds City Council that already have planning permission, and also, to revitalise housing currently standing empty, rather than look to build on Greenfield areas.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Susan Burnley

Representor No: PRS02827

Representation ID: REP05380 Question Ref: H1

As residents of Churwell, we are writing with regard to the proposed housing development sites within our local community. We all share the boundary of one of the sites in question, Site 1220A 'Land East of Churwell', and are particularly concerned over any possible proposal to build in this location. We understand this is currently classified as 'Amber: Sites which have potential but issues / not as favoured as green sites'. As clearly some of the issues have already been identified, we would like to re-iterate and clarify some of the issues that are of greatest concern to us as residents immediately neighbouring this location. Churwell Hill / Elland Road is the main road from Morley towards Leeds, and as such suffers from a very high volume of traffic, particularly at commuting hours, when the traffic is at standstill to and from the Ring Road. This road does not have the ability to cope with greater volumes of traffic passing through the area, without creating greater risks to safety (cyclists, pedestrians, drivers) and increased congestion. This has already been identified as an issue as there are a number of speed cameras within a short space along this road. This particular site, lies next to a busy train line, again posing dangers to locals, as it is not unusual for us to see people walking next to or crossing over the train line. This risk would only increase with additional housing in the area. Additionally, we understand the site has been identified as a historical land-fill area, again highlighting unsuitability. Regarding the 6 sites identified in Churwell overall, the general infrastructure within the village is not of a scale that could accommodate such volumes of new houses, schools, doctors, dentists, and services in general would not be able to take on a new influx of residents. Based on these, and other points, we strongly support the re-classification of this area (Site 1220A), and the other proposed Churwell sites, to colour code 'Red: Sites not considered suitable for allocation of housing'. Instead, we would ask the Planning Department to look at the areas within Leeds City Council that already have planning permission, and also, to revitalise housing currently standing empty, rather than look to build on Greenfield areas.

Name: Ken M

Representor No: PRS02829

Representation ID: REP05382 Question Ref: H1

As residents of Churwell, we are writing with regard to the proposed housing development sites within our local community. We all share the boundary of one of the sites in question, Site 1220A 'Land East of Churwell', and are particularly concerned over any possible proposal to build in this location. We understand this is currently classified as 'Amber: Sites which have potential but issues / not as favoured as green sites'. As clearly some of the issues have already been identified, we would like to re-iterate and clarify some of the issues that are of greatest concern to us as residents immediately neighbouring this location. Churwell Hill / Elland Road is the main road from Morley towards Leeds, and as such suffers from a very high volume of traffic, particularly at commuting hours, when the traffic is at standstill to and from the Ring Road. This road does not have the ability to cope with greater volumes of traffic passing through the area, without creating greater risks to safety (cyclists, pedestrians, drivers) and increased congestion. This has already been identified as an issue as there are a number of speed cameras within a short space along this road. This particular site, lies next to a busy train line, again posing dangers to locals, as it is not unusual for us to see people walking next to or crossing over the train line. This risk would only increase with additional housing in the area. Additionally, we understand the site has been identified as a historical land-fill area, again highlighting unsuitability. Regarding the 6 sites identified in Churwell overall, the general infrastructure within the village is not of a scale that could accommodate such volumes of new houses, schools, doctors, dentists, and services in general would not be able to take on a new influx of residents. Based on these, and other points, we strongly support the re-classification of this area (Site 1220A), and the other proposed Churwell sites, to colour code 'Red: Sites not considered suitable for allocation of housing'. Instead, we would ask the Planning Department to look at the areas within Leeds City Council that already have planning permission, and also, to revitalise housing currently standing empty, rather than look to build on Greenfield areas.

Name: Martin Walsh

Representor No: PRS03239

Representation ID: REP01979 Question Ref: H11

1282 - see comments above - a development of this size would have to include long term investment in schools and other infrastructure

Representation ID: REP01979 Question Ref: H2

1282 - I do not see how the existing infrastructure of Churwell can support a further 600ish houses on this site. The A643 is a busy road already and surely some alternative new access road (i.e. to the east of the proposed development) would be needed. Also this would put severe pressure on already oversubscribed schools in the area. Any development of that size would need to be treated almost as a new town, with new shops, pubs, park etc - rather than a bolt-on to what is already in the area.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Wayne Metcalfe

Representor No: PRS03466

Representation ID: REP03598 Question Ref: H1

I write to provide comments to inform the on-going consultation regarding the Draft Site Allocations Plan (DSAP) forming part of the range of documents forming the Leeds Development Framework. From the various documents available on line it is not clear if comments have to be provided through the online submission form or if any other form of communication is precluded so on this basis I have assumed the submission of comments by letter is acceptable and believe that if this is not the case I should be advised accordingly.

I have divided my letter into distinct sections for clarity, these are as follows:

- Site Specific Comments: Site Ref 1282 Plan 10.3 Housing — Outer South West — 542 houses
- Alternative Sites and Strategies
- Consultation Process
- Further Information Required

Site Specific Comments: Site Ref 1282 Plan 10.3 Housing — Outer South West — 542 houses

1. Access to site ref 1282 is from an existing access off the A643, this access is almost opposite

Westwoodside - The only access to a large area of existing housing and the access route to Churwell Primary School. Existing housing bounding the A643 precludes creation of another access until the far south west end of the site where it opens again onto the A643. Any access in this area could also then be almost opposite the 2nd interface between

Westwoodside and the A643. Given the significant number of houses proposed for this site, the subsequent number of vehicles (at least 750) and the high flows on the A643 I struggle to understand how such a junction could be formed without the introduction of signal control. This is eluded to in the site assessment but the scores do not appear to have been down-rated to reflect this significant issue

2. All traffic wishing to enter or leave the site will only have 2 options to leave the area. It will have to travel along the A643. At the North West end of the A643 at the roundabout with the A6110 traffic congestion is significant at both morning and evening peak with hazardous conditions generally prevailing on the roundabout. There are significant queues on the A6110 in the evening and on the approach from the A643 in the morning. To provide for such an increase in traffic significant remodelling of this junction would be required. To leave the area to the South West traffic would have to negotiate several already over capacity junctions with associated queuing to navigate around Morley. Again significant improvements would be required at several of the affected junctions. Furthermore all the additional traffic would only serve to worsen the current traffic safety situation through Churwell. The addition of traffic signals at a 4 way junction would require significant periods of at red time on the A643 and this again would have a significant impact on traffic flows

3. No account seems to have been taken of the capacity of the local primary or secondary schools to cater for the significant increase in demand that would arise from the addition of 542 houses to the area. Furthermore from reviewing the existing infrastructure arrangements at the local primary school it does not appear to readily lend itself to capacity enhancement. I am less familiar with the opportunities to enhance the capacity at the secondary schools in Morley but would suggest such a matter should be investigated and the outcomes communicated before consultation on this matter should close. I can only assume that the introduction of such a number of properties would also affect the boundary/catchment arrangements for primary and secondary schools meaning that more children will not be able to obtain places at their local school thus invoking a need for travel by public or private transport to another school further afield

4. No account seems to have been taken of the impact the proposed development would have on essential services such as Doctor's surgeries. The existing provision is already overstretched

5. The fact that the development of site 1282 will effectively completely link the conurbations of Morley and Churwell seems to have been completely ignored in the assessment. Had the land been previously designated 'green belt' perhaps these sections of the Site Assessments would have been completed and it would then have been obvious to the assessors that the development of this site is entirely inappropriate. A simple review of any aerial image of the area shows how this further unrestricted development would harm the area

6. No information has been provided to demonstrate that the existing statutory utility provisions in the main A643 service corridor that serves the area have been reviewed and found to have capacity for such a significant development

7. The fact that the provision of fire fighting services in the area is currently under review and should the current proposal prevail it will be unable to provide the same level of protection to existing properties without considering such a significant new development

8. It is not clear if the distance to the nearest train station, an obvious factor in the assessment, is by pedestrian route or straight line. Access to the train station in Morley is poor and its use low so this factor should not be overstated in any assessment

9. Public transport runs at capacity on the A643 at present and further bus services would be required to serve an increased population; this will then only serve to worsen the traffic situation on the road. This situation is exasperated by the steepness and length of gradient of the road through Churwell which only increases the hazard presented by large vehicles such as buses

10. The land is currently high grade agricultural land used for arable farming yielding crop every year, how can any strategy that take such land out of food production and replacing with housing when so many sites lie derelict be a justifiable or sustainable solution In assigning a green rating to this site none of the forgoing issues seem to have been considered in any detail, if at all. As such I find it impossible to understand how the site can be assigned a green rating. It is obvious to all that should it be assigned a green rating it is, subject to the economic conditions at the time, inevitable that developers will be attracted to the site as the granting of planning permission for such green sites will be a foregone conclusion. As such I wish to record my formal objection to the proposal.

Alternative Sites and Strategies

Brown field sites or those that at 1st assessment appear a little more difficult to develop appear to have been discounted in favour of sites such as Site 1282. Surely the Council has an obligation to ensure that the review and assessment process is weighted correctly in favour of the issues that matter to existing residents in areas and not the commercially driven agenda of developers who wish to minimise land and improvement costs and maximise profit with little or no concern for those they affect. From my review of the sites in the area that have been marked red or amber, in the majority of cases the only issues with the sites are those that could be resolved with investment by developers. I would suggest though that access scores used should be reviewed to ensure such issues are not over rated and as such used to distort score summaries. I note that some of the material issued asks that if people can identify land that is not included in the plan. While the sentiment is admirable I cannot imagine many residents have the time, resources of knowledge to identify many other sites. I would suggest though that all the issues affecting the decisions should be made holistically and, without contradicting the overall assessment of housing needs and taking this as fact, surely a review of larger areas suitable for development which includes all essentials services including schools and associated infrastructure requirements would ultimately yield a more appropriate result. There are several areas of the city that have been 'opened up' by relatively new highway schemes such as the construction of the East Leeds Link and it's connection to the M1 surely these could form part of an overall development strategy rather than trying to find enough small sites to meet the housing needs that each in turn has a significant detrimental impact on those in the existing areas and on services in the vicinity. As such I wish to record that I believe no agricultural land should be used to until all brownfield sites in adjacent areas have been developed. The additional cost of developing such sites should not be a reason to use agricultural land first.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Wayne Metcalfe

Representor No: PRS03466

Furthermore I believe that the strategy at present is too disjointed and does not represent a structured and sustainable plan for the city.

Consultation Process

I do not believe that you will have effectively consulted with all the residents in the area as we have had to rely on media coverage and the hard work of local community groups to provide information and direction to your web site. Many people will then find the information difficult to understand and will not understand the impact of the proposals on the local area and furthermore how decisions made now will affect the planning process in the future and as such development patterns for many years to come. I am of the opinion that every householder should have been provided with direct mail information and further public meetings and exhibitions should be arranged at suitable times when a cross section of the population can attend. These should be published in all suitable local community outlets including media options, schools, shops and surgeries. Many people were only aware of the single event in Morley when it was either too late to attend or indeed the date had passed. A single event also meant those unable to attend were left with no face to face contact options thereafter. I believe the number of attendee's should be identified and this given as a percentage of those affected to demonstrate the effectiveness, or otherwise of the event.

Further Information Required

I believe that the following information should be made available to the public to allow a fully informed consultation to be carried out and the consultation should not be closed until the information has been issued and adequate time allowed for those affected to review the information and respond:

1. Proposed impact on traffic flows on the A643 and the junctions which provide access to Churwell with details of the proposed mitigation measures that will be a condition of planning permission granted for any development in the area. Traffic model information should be available as should the results any early stage road safety audit reviews of improvement proposals
2. What road safety improvements would be made on the A643 through Churwell
3. Details of how any highway improvement works will be funded and a surety that they will be constructed before occupation of any new properties rather than years afterwards which is often the case
4. Proposals for schooling both of primary and secondary age children and how the proposed developments will impact upon catchment areas for existing housing areas
5. How essential services such as Doctor's surgeries, minor injury units, dentists and emergency service arrangements will be enhanced to allow for the increase in population in the area
6. Details of caveats and restrictions that would be imposed upon developers should planning permission be granted such as form of property and use restrictions
7. Details of how the scoring system has been devised and the process used to assign each score to each category.
8. Who has scored the sites and if the views of a full range of built environment professionals have been involved in the process, including Engineers, Architects and Planner.
9. Details of why some sites with the same score have different ratings
10. Why the development of brown field sites has not been given the priority it should have been in the proposals

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Wayne Metcalfe

Representor No: PRS03466

Representation ID: REP00802 Question Ref: H2

Please refer to letter sent by email and post [Copied from original response]

I write to provide comments to inform the on-going consultation regarding the Draft Site Allocations Plan (DSAP) forming part of the range of documents forming the Leeds Development Framework.

From the various documents available on line it is not clear if comments have to be provided through the online submission form or if any other form of communication is precluded so on this basis I have assumed the submission of comments by letter is acceptable and believe that if this is not the case I should be advised accordingly.

I have divided my letter into distinct sections for clarity, these are as follows:

- Site Specific Comments: Site Ref 1282 Plan 10.3 Housing – Outer South West – 542 houses
- Alternative Sites and Strategies
- Consultation Process
- Further Information Required

Site Specific Comments: Site Ref 1282 Plan 10.3 Housing – Outer South West – 542 houses

- 1.Access to site ref 1282 is from an existing access off the A643, this access is almost opposite Westwoodside, the only access to a large area of existing housing and the access route to Churwell Primary School. Existing housing bounding the A643 precludes creation of another access until the far south west end of the site where it opens again onto the A643. Any access in this area could also then be almost opposite the 2nd interface between Westwoodside and the A643. Given the significant number of houses proposed for this site, the subsequent number of vehicles (at least 750) and the high flows on the A643 I struggle to understand how such a junction could be formed without the introduction of signal control. This is eluded to in the site assessment but the scores do not appear to have been down-rated to reflect this significant issue
- 2.All traffic wishing to enter or leave the site will only have 2 options to leave the area. It will have to travel along the A643. At the North West end of the A643 at the roundabout with the A6110 traffic congestion is significant at both morning and evening peak with hazardous conditions generally prevailing on the roundabout. There are significant queues on the A6110 in the evening and on the approach from the A643 in the morning. To provide for such an increase in traffic significant remodelling of this junction would be required. To leave the area to the South West traffic would have to negotiate several already over capacity junctions with associated queuing to navigate around Morley. Again significant improvements would be required at several of the affected junctions. Furthermore all the additional traffic would only serve to worsen the current traffic safety situation through Churwell. The addition of traffic signals at a 4 way junction would require significant periods of at red time on the A643 and this again would have a significant impact on traffic flows
- 3.No account seems to have been taken of the capacity of the local primary or secondary schools to cater for the significant increase in demand that would arise from the addition of 542 houses to the area. Furthermore from reviewing the existing infrastructure arrangements at the local primary school it does not appear to readily lend itself to capacity enhancement. I am less familiar with the opportunities to enhance the capacity at the secondary schools in Morley but would suggest such a matter should be investigated and the outcomes communicated before consultation on this matter should close. I can only assume that the introduction of such a number of properties would also affect the boundary/catchment arrangements for primary and secondary schools meaning that more children will not be able to obtain places at their local school thus invoking a need for travel by public or private transport to another school further afield
- 4.No account seems to have been taken of the impact the proposed development would have on essential services such as Doctor's surgeries. The existing provision is already overstretched
- 5.The fact that the development of site 1282 will effectively completely link the conurbations of Morley and Churwell seems to have been completely ignored in the assessment. Had the land been previously designated 'green belt' perhaps these sections of the Site Assessments would have been completed and it would then have been obvious to the assessors that the development of this site is entirely inappropriate. A simple review of any aerial image of the area shows how this further unrestricted development would harm the area
- 6.No information has been provided to demonstrate that the existing statutory utility provisions in the main A643 service corridor that serves the area have been reviewed and found to have capacity for such a significant development
- 7.The fact that the provision of fire fighting services in the area is currently under review and should the current proposal prevail it will be unable to provide the same level of protection to existing properties without considering such a significant new development
- 8.It is not clear if the distance to the nearest train station, an obvious factor in the assessment, is by pedestrian route or straight line. Access to the train station in Morley is poor and its use low so this factor should not be overstated in any assessment
- 9.Public transport runs at capacity on the A643 at present and further bus services would be required to serve an increased population; this will then only serve to worsen the traffic situation on the road. This situation is exasperated by the steepness and length of gradient of the road through Churwell which only increases the hazard presented by large vehicles such as buses
- 10.The land is currently high grade agricultural land used for arable farming yielding crop every year, how can any strategy that take such land out of food production and replacing with housing when so many sites lie derelict be a justifiable or sustainable solution

In assigning a green rating to this site none of the forgoing issues seem to have been considered in any detail, if at all. As such I find it impossible to understand how the site can be assigned a green rating. It is obvious to all that should it be assigned a green rating it is, subject to the economic conditions at the time, inevitable that developers will be attracted to the site as the granting of planning permission for such green sites will be a foregone conclusion. As such I wish to record my formal objection to the proposal.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Mark Gordon

Representor No: PRS03973

Representation ID: REP00671 Question Ref: H2

1282 Lane Side Farm Provides separation between Morley and Churwell. Planning has already been rejected for houses along the roadside in this area for a range of reasons so how can the site be suitable for the development of several hundred houses. Poor access due to high differences between the existing highway and this farm land. Would put too much strain on the existing road network which is already congested and is a key arterial route into and out of Leeds. The road cannot be expanded due to current developments. This development would set a precedent for further urban sprawl. Also represents a coalescence of the settlements several hundred houses. Poor access due to high differences between the existing highway and this farm land. Would put too much strain on the existing road network which is already congested and is a key arterial route into and out of Leeds. The road cannot be expanded due to current developments. This development would set a precedent for further urban sprawl. Also represents a coalescence of the settlements of Churwell and Morley which is to be avoided. Supporting infrastructure ie schools, doctors, dentists etc already at capacity how can hundreds of extra children be accommodated? You have no plans to increase the numbers of schools etc.

Name: Richard Coldron

Representor No: PRS04196

Representation ID: REP00327 Question Ref: H9

1282 Green land and heavily used road network Schools are full and services stretched. Increased risk of fatalities on roads.

Representation ID: REP00327 Question Ref: H2

1282 - current allocation is green - needs to change to green belt protected area. Reasons Busy road network cannot take increased capacity. Increasing risk of fatalities for road users and pedestrians. Schools are full with parents already having to go further a field for their child's education. Added burden to GP, Dentists, Police, Ambulance and Fire services. Loss of green space and wildlife within Churwell. Loss of farming land. Loss of a beautiful area enjoyed by hundreds of walkers and residents. 3060 should be made a green allocation

Name: Mark Houston

Representor No: PRS04641

Representation ID: REP00006 Question Ref: H11

1285, 1282 and 1171B should all be considered short

Name: Keith & Margaret Barber

Representor No: PRS05245

Representation ID: REP05839 Question Ref: H1

We wish to object and protest in the strongest possible terms to the proposals for building 1248 houses in Churwell.

The site numbers are 1282, 2125, 122A, 1099A, 1099B, 1996. Any research into the Churwell area will indicate how impractical these proposals are.

There is only one road in & out of Churwell which is already heavily congested during normal time and becomes completely gridlocked in the a.m. & p.m. rush hours it is also a major health & safety hazard as any observations will indicate.

Access to these proposed sites would add significantly to the already existing problems. There is already a shortage of places at schools in the area, additional population would necessitate commuting for children making even more traffic problems.

We would request that you take serious consideration of the items highlighted in this letter and permit the existing population to enjoy their amenity in safety and comfort.

Name: Sylvia Elsby

Representor No: PRS05430

Representation ID: REP06037 Question Ref: H1

1282 – Suggested change GREEN to RED

Reason for change - In Greenbelt there are few "green" areas left in Churwell prime arable land. . Need to retain a clear boundary between Churwell and Morley.

Other remarks – Infrastructure won't support vast building of houses, doctors, dentists and schools are filled to capacity. Concerns about access also, Elland Road/Victoria Road heavily congested, especially at peak periods

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Jacqueline Daniel

Representor No: PRS05449

Representation ID: REP06061 Question Ref: H1

1282 – Suggested change GREEN to RED

Reason for change – There are insufficient places at the local schools at present where will the children go to school when Churwell children are been sent to Beeston /Middelton already? The doctors are full as are the dentists. There is a poor infrastructure which cannot support further development.

Name: Persimmon Homes

Representor No: PRS05691

Representation ID: REP06835 Question Ref: H1

We support the identification of site ref: 1282 as having the greatest potential to be allocated for housing. It is currently identified in the adopted Unitary Development Plan (UDP) as PAS (Protected Area of Search) Land and there are no physical or technical constraints restricting its delivery as a housing site.

Representation ID: REP06494 Question Ref: H1

Lane Side Farm, Morley (1282)

We support the identified of Lane Side Farm (Ref: 1282) as a "Green Site". It is identified in the adopted UDP as PAS Land and as such the principle of development has been accepted.

Persimmon Homes supports the principle of identifying this site as green and has the following comments which should be taken into account in the site assessment:

☐ The assessment refers to the presence of Listed Buildings but this is not the case. There are no Listed Buildings in the vicinity for the site and the assessment should be amended to reflect this.

☐ Site details:

- Distances: The Council should make it clear at what point and route has been used in identifying the distance to a rail station and bus stop.

- Green Belt: The assessment indicates that the site is partially within the Green Belt when it is not. The assessment should be amended to reflect this.

☐ SHLAA: Persimmon Homes has an interest in the site and is committed to bringing forward this site for development. Therefore, the site is available, suitable and achievable.

☐ Conformity with the Core Strategy: The site is well related to a major settlement and would be a major settlement extension.

The Council has scored this site 11 out of 15. However, it is unclear at this stage what methodology the Council has used in reaching this conclusion and we, therefore, reserve the right to comment in more detail until this information has been made available.

We recommend the Council:

☐ Clarifies how it has assessed the distance to the rail station and nearest bus stop.

☐ States that the site is available, suitable and achievable.

☐ Updates the assessment to remove references to Listed Buildings.

☐ States that the development of this site conforms with the aims and objectives of the emerging Core Strategy.

☐ Provide further information on what has been used to rank the site.

☐ Clarifies the Green Belt status of the site.

Therefore, Persimmon Homes recommends the Council should identify this site as a preferred option for housing, suitable for immediate delivery, at the next stage of the Site Allocation DPD process.

See rep for full details.

Representation ID: REP06494 Question Ref: H11

Site ref: 1282 is available immediately for development. Therefore we consider development can be achieved on the site in the short term i.e. within 5 years and leading into the medium to longer term.

Name: Michael Harrison

Representor No: PRS06042

Representation ID: REP06880 Question Ref: H4

Firstly I find it amazing our council can ever consider building more houses in Churwell when the facilities such as schools, doctors, are already over full capacity.

The traffic in Churwell is already at dangerous levels. The roads in and around Churwell are already over the capacity they can cope with.

Churwell is a village, let us keep it that way otherwise it will just become an extension of Leeds city centre.

I also feel there is no demand for more houses in Churwell. The fact LCC is even considering these sites tells me LCC is not considering the feelings of its residents and its repairs to roads, etc is already a great let down. Totally I am in disagreement with any of these sites for the above reasons.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Mark Hudson

Representor No: PRS06170

Representation ID: REP07059 Question Ref: H1

1282 – Change suggested GREEN to RED

Other remarks – The school is full, try going down Churwell Hill at 7.15am

Name: Anthony Holmes

Representor No: PRS06179

Representation ID: REP07067 Question Ref: H1

1282 – Change suggested GREEN to RED

Reason – Greenfield Site

Other remarks – Usually 2 cars per house so 1000+ cars on Churwell Hill, plus pollution.

Name: Janice Curnyn

Representor No: PRS06209

Representation ID: REP06113 Question Ref: H1

1282 – Change suggested GREEN to RED

Reasons

1. Very heavy traffic congestion at peak hours that will worsen considerably

2. Major impact on already insufficient schools, doctors, dentists.

3. Loss of Green Site that is a Farm. Again this area is important in absorbing pollution as well as being a working farm. It is also important in being a site that gives Churwell one of its few village characteristics that remains.

Other remarks If Green areas are continually built on then you will end up with urban sprawl and areas such as Churwell and Morley lose the very thing that people want as an area to live. Namely attractive, with open green areas and individuality.

Name: H Pearson

Representor No: PRS06546

Representation ID: REP02130 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Change from Green to Red. In Green belt. Gelderd Road has much more space. Victoria Road cannot cope with any more traffic or pollution.

Name: A Tighe

Representor No: PRS06547

Representation ID: REP02131 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Change from Green to Red. In the Green belt. There would be very serious traffic problems at Victoria Road (example highway can only repair between 9:30 & 3:30 due to current traffic volumes)

Representation ID: REP02131 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Change from Green to Red. Loss of local amenity though LCC are trying to promote a green world?

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 4 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' and 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network.

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network)

From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service frequency levels.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites - green sites are linked to this comment]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H1

Disagree with Council's green assessment, think the site should be amber

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H1

Disagree with Council's green assessment, think the site should be amber

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1282

Housing

Lane Side Farm, PAS Morley

Name: Alan Bellwood

Representor No: PRS07148

Representation ID: REP08304 Question Ref: H1

1282 / 2125 -

I wish to object to the above plans for the following reasons:-

Some of the sites are on green belt land such as 1282— Laneside Farm. I think it is important to preserve some green spaces locally as once they are built on, they will be lost forever!

The 1282 Laneside Farm and 2125 Manor House Farm sites in particular separate Churwell from Morley which helps Churwell retain its village character. The same can be said for all sites as they are all bordering Churwell.

Local Schools cannot cope with the number of children currently enrolling into them. My son started Churwell School in 2012 at which there were 85 applicants for only 60 places in the reception year. Some Churwell children were allocated places outside the area in Beeston, etc. Other Schools in Morley similarly had greater numbers of applications than places resulting in an extra class having to be run in Asquith School, Morley. The numbers of houses proposed for the area will obviously mean that there would be a huge increase in children in the area which will affect both primary and high schools. Local councillors/MPs are campaigning for Churwell children to be offered places at Churwell Schools and also Morley children to be offered a place at a Morley school where it has been requested.

Doctors and dentists are at capacity currently.

Such a massive development will have an impact on the roads. It is now 'the norm' for traffic to queue out of Churwell towards the ring road on a morning and for a slow crawl of traffic back up through Churwell in the evening rush hour. Not only would extra traffic inconvenience road users further, but I think pollution increases should be looked into too.

Finally, I am aware that these developments have been publicised and that there is a lot of local opposition to them. Please remember that the council is run to represent the community and allowing unsustainable levels of house building such as these is against the vast majority of the public's wishes. I would suggest visiting Churwell to conduct a survey to assess opinion of the public. Please side with the Leeds communities rather than the national house builders.

I sincerely trust you will give the above comments your consideration and look at this matter in a sensible way by transferring ALL OF THESE SITES TO RED.

Name: Unidentifiable

Representor No: PRS99999

Representation ID: REP02457 Question Ref: H1

1282 - Change from Green to Red. In Green Belt. Schools, dentists and doctors and roads all really busy.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1283

Housing

Lane Side Farm Extension, Morley

Name: Lynne Paul

Representor No: PRS01169

Representation ID: REP05294 Question Ref: H4

Land side farm site ref 1283. Keep Red.
This land is unsuitable for development because of its position next to the railway and the total lack of road access. There are very few green spaces in this part of Morley North, and the land would be better used as public park land

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1283

Housing

Lane Side Farm Extension, Morley

Name: Persimmon Homes

Representor No: PRS05691

Representation ID: REP06835 Question Ref: H7

We support the residential allocation of site ref: 1283.

See rep for full details.

Representation ID: REP07054 Question Ref: H7

Site 1283

Persimmon does not agree with the red assessment of the site.

We are unclear as to why site 1283 is considered red whilst 1282 is considered green (which Persimmon support). These sites are immediately adjacent to each other and would logically form part of a phased development. Site 1283 would come forward as a further phase following the development of Site 1282.

The basis of the Council's red rating is the sites location within the Green Belt and concerns about its isolation and access requirements. In reality, this site will come forward as a comprehensive masterplan with Site 1282 and will be a later phase once the requisite access infrastructure has been put in place.

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.

The sprawl of Morley will be maintained by the railway line to the east. This is a defensible boundary and will, therefore, maintain separation between Morley and Middleton.

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another.

The merging of Morley and Middleton will be prevented by the railway line to the east. This is a defensible boundary and will, therefore, maintain separation between Morley and Middleton.

Safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Encroachment into the countryside will be restricted by the railway line.

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Lane Side Farm (extension) does not contribute to the setting and special character of a historic town.

Assist urban regeneration

Releasing this site from the Green Belt for housing will contribute to a demonstrable need for housing in Morley that cannot be met by existing sites outside the Green Belt.

We recommend the Council:

- ☐ Clarifies how it has assessed the distance to the rail station and nearest bus stop.
- ☐ States that the site is available, suitable and achievable.
- ☐ Updates the assessment to remove references to Listed Buildings.
- ☐ States that the development of this site conforms with the Core Strategy and is major settlement extension, along with Site 1282.
- ☐ Provide further information on what has been used to rank the site.
- ☐ Clarifies the Green Belt status of the site.

Therefore, Persimmon Homes recommends the Council should identify this site as a preferred option for housing at the next stage of the Site Allocation DPD process.

See rep for details

Representation ID: REP06494 Question Ref: H7

Please refer to our response to H3.

"H3. We consider site 1283 should be colour coded green."

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1283

Housing

Lane Side Farm Extension, Morley

Name: Persimmon Homes

Representor No: PRS05691

Representation ID: REP06056 Question Ref: H7

Lane Side Farm
(Extension)

Site Allocation Reference:
1283

Overall

4.2 We are unclear as to why site 1283 is considered red whilst 1282 is considered green (which Persimmon support). These sites are immediately adjacent to each other and would logically form part of a phased development. Site 1283 would come forward as a further phase following the development of Site 1282. Because of the scale of housing required and the amount of land that should be released, 1283 is needed for housing growth. Please also note that the site does not fulfil the five purposes of Green Belt, which we consider in more detail below.

4.3 Persimmon Homes has an interest Lane Side Farm (extension) and is committed to bringing forward this site for development. Therefore the site is available, suitable and achievable. The site conforms with the Core Strategy as it is well related to a major settlement and would be a major settlement extension, contributing to an identified need for housing in Outer South West HMA and Morley.

Objection

4.4 Persimmon does not agree with the red assessment of the site.

4.5 The basis of the Council's red rating is the sites location within the Green Belt and concerns about its isolation and access requirements. In reality, this site will come forward as a comprehensive masterplan with Site 1282 and will be a later phase once the requisite access infrastructure has been put in place.

4.6 We do not consider that the site meets the five purposes of the Green Belt.

6 Conclusions

6.1 Overall whilst Persimmon Homes welcome the consultation of the Site Allocations Issues and Options DPD, they do have concerns with some of the Council's assumptions by way of how much growth is planned for. We refer to section 4 for more details. However, some of these points will no doubt be debated at the forthcoming examination of the Core Strategy which will have implications for the Site Allocations DPD.

6.2 Persimmon Homes disagrees that the Council has scored the site red and considers that housing is deliverable on the site, contributing to an identified need for housing in the Outer South West HMA and Morley. Our assessment of the site recommends that some amendments to the Council's assessment in order to clarify the site details and provide further information on what has been used to rank the site.

6.3 We would therefore be grateful if the Council takes these representations into consideration and keeps us informed on all stages of the Site Allocation process. See also representation submitted for full details

Representation ID: REP06494 Question Ref: H7

No. We consider site 1283 should be coded green, please see our submissions made above.

Representation ID: REP06494 Question Ref: H7

We consider site 1283 should be colour coded green.

Representation ID: REP06894 Question Ref: H11

We consider that site 1283 [unclear if they actually mean sites 1220B and 2164] are available immediately for development. Therefore we consider development can be achieved on the sites in the short term i.e. within 5 years and leading into the medium to longer term.

Representation ID: REP07054 Question Ref: H11

We consider that site 1283 are available immediately for development. Therefore we consider development can be achieved on the sites in the short term i.e. within 5 years and leading into the medium to longer term.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1283

Housing

Lane Side Farm Extension, Morley

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1284A

Housing

Albert Drive - Low Moor Farm Extension, Morley

Name: Ian Dickinson

Representor No: PRS00146

Representation ID: REP00920 Question Ref: H1

1284A - Green to red. As the same problems with the sites above. No scope for extra roads, schools, health centres etc.

Name: Janice Dickinson

Representor No: PRS00147

Representation ID: REP00921 Question Ref: H1

1284A - Green to red. Congestion around area. No infrastructure set up to accommodate extra school pupils, health centres etc.

Name: Alan Haigh

Representor No: PRS01638

Representation ID: REP03792 Question Ref: H1

563 / 1284A / 1320 -

Leeds LDF Draft Housing Site Allocations.

I have studied the draft proposals for housing in the areas where we live and frequently use.

The proposals are considered to be excessive for such a small area and Morley seems to be taking a disproportionate amount of development. We have already had some poor planning in our area with over development and a lack of facilities such as open spaces and loss of footpaths.

There should therefore be no major development on our green belt. Instead any housing should be on brown field land or infill sites. These should be linked to improving our poor environment.

I attach a table and sketch map showing common sense counter proposals for this area. This shows that 397 houses could be built in our area linked to an improvement in our local facilities such as access to green spaces, cycleways and footpaths plus better links to our railway station which is due to be electrified.

Our area needs to be comprehensively planned to improve the area as a whole where everything links together rather than piecemeal planning.

I trust that these will be very carefully considered by the Council.

Yours faithfully,

[Table and map scanned]

My comments on individual sites:

Site no.	No.units	Object or support	Remarks
126	116	object	This site is an eyesore and should be cleared.
Housing should then be built on the site incorporating a high quality footpath and cycleway. The only way that we can resolve this problem area is through development.			
563	40	support	
1280		support	Station Road park. Although this is neglected it is a valuable open space and should not be built on
1282		object	Valuable green belt should remain untouched,
1284A	44	support	Fringe of built up area
1319	75	object	This has no public access to the site and is untidy and neglected. Houses should therefore be built on it which if done competently would vastly improve the site with improved access to the railway station and green spaces to the east. It is the old Morley Main colliery site and any development should include marker and also a memorial to all the miners who died in the Morley Main Colliery disaster.
1320		object	Valuable green open space
3428	22	support	
338/531	100		Daisy Hill with planning permission
Total 387			

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1284A

Housing

Albert Drive - Low Moor Farm Extension, Morley

Name: Richard Marshall

Representor No: PRS03170

Representation ID: REP01024 Question Ref: H5

1079, 1072, 1077, 1143B, 1143D, 1171B, 1200A, 1258, 1284a, 1285, 1344, 2098a, 3365, 3456A.2098C, 2105, 2155, 3000, 3056.3064, 3078A, 4004, and 4029. As previously stated the amber sites that are greenbelt land should not be considered for development. Site 1032 is designated as a protected area of search this land has been retained along the edge of the existing settlement pending more suitable sites being found in the longer term this site should only be developed as a last resort.

Representation ID: REP01024 Question Ref: H2

1079, 1072, 1077, 1143B, 1143D, 1171B, 1200A, 1258, 1284a, 1285, 1344, 2098a, 3365, 3456A. All these sites are green belt sites , green belt land is there to stop urban sprawl and the destruction of the countryside that still remains in this area. If sites 1143B, 1143D, 1143F, 2155, 1274, 1032, and 2128 are built on East Ardsley West Ardsley and Tingley will just become one built up area hemmed in by the M62. Not all of these are greenbelt sites but if the development is allowed the basic principal of having greenbelt in this area will be completely wrecked!

Name: Persimmon Homes

Representor No: PRS05691

Representation ID: REP06784 Question Ref: H1

Site 1284A

Whilst Persimmon Homes is supportive of the identification of this site for allocation, they have the following comments which could be used to strengthen the case for its allocation, namely:

- Site Details
- Distances - The Council should make clear at what point / route it has used in identifying the distance to a rail station and bus stop.
- Listed Buildings – The site is bound by agricultural fields and residential development. We would therefore contend that there are no listed buildings effected by the development of this site for residential development.
- SHLAA – Persimmon Homes has an interest in this site and is committed to bringing forward this site for development. Therefore the site is available, suitable and achievable.
- Conformity with Core Strategy – The site is well related to a major settlement and would be a major settlement greenfield extension.

Green Belt Assessment

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

In landscape character terms the site is already contained within two arms of built development that extend up to its western and southern boundaries. This development is suburban in nature comprising semi-detached and terraced dwellings with conventional front garden boundary details and associated vegetation, together with other properties.

Residential development on the site would not extend the built-up area of Morley in any meaningful way but could rather be interpreted as 'in-fill' of an existing urban area. The site does not therefore fulfil this purpose of Green Belt.

To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Persimmon Homes objects that the grade of the site is 1.2 or 3a agricultural land value. We therefore request that the Council provides further information on how it has reached this conclusion.

Coalescence / Conclusion inconsistency

The overall coalescence conclusion states that there is no defensible boundary for the site. However, the conclusion summary states that 'the site has an existing defensible boundary'.

Our recommended changes

We would recommend that the Council:

- Clarifies how it has assessed the distance to the rail station and bus stop.
- References that no Listed Buildings would be affected as the result of developing this site for housing.
- States that the site is available, suitable and achievable.
- States that the development of this site confirms with the Core Strategy and is a major settlement greenfield extension.
- Amends the overall sprawl conclusion that there would be no potential for unrestricted sprawl.
- Provides further information on the agricultural land classification assumption.
- Amend the coalescence assessment, stating the site has a defensible boundary.
- Provides further information on what information it has used to rank the site.

See rep for full details

Representation ID: REP06784 Question Ref: H11

We consider that sites 1284A, 1284B and 1320 are available immediately for development. Therefore we consider development can be achieved on the sites in the short term i.e. within 5 years and leading into the medium to longer term.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1284A

Housing

Albert Drive - Low Moor Farm Extension, Morley

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H1

Disagree with Council's green assessment, think the site should be red

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H1

Disagree with Council's green assessment, think the site should be red

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1284B

Housing

Albert Drive - Low Moor Farm Extension, Morley

Name: Persimmon Homes

Representor No: PRS05691

Representation ID: REP06784 Question Ref: H7

Persimmon Homes consider that 1284B is a suitable location for residential development and believe that the following issues should be addressed by the Council in reassessing the site:

- Site Details
- Distances - The Council should make clear at what point / route it has used in identifying the distance to a rail station and bus stop.
- Listed Buildings – The site is bound by agricultural fields and residential development. We would therefore contend that there are no listed buildings effected by the development of this site for residential development.
- SHLAA – Persimmon Homes has an interest in this site and is committed to bringing forward this site for development. Therefore the site is available, suitable and achievable.
- Conformity with Core Strategy – The site is well related to a major settlement and would be a major settlement greenfield extension.

Green Belt Assessment

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

In landscape character terms the site is already fully contained to the east by the existing woodland and would act as a natural second phase following the development of 1284A and / or 1320, located immediately to the west of this site. Therefore the existing woodland to the east would provide a natural boundary to the east and would round of the settlement of Morley in this location.

Therefore the development of this site would no lead to unrestricted sprawl and is a logical extension to Morley in this location.

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

The nearest settlement to the east of Morley – lies around 2 kilometres to the west and the intervening land is rural in character - other than the A653 which passes roughly midway between the two settlements. Whilst the site itself is open and rural in character at the present time it is relatively selfcontained, in visual terms, bounded by mature hedges and trees to the east, and by the existing development to the west.

This, together with the landform and vegetation means that the two settlements are not visually connected. Consequently there is a clear and distinct separation between the settlements and the site does not therefore meet this purpose of the Green Belt land.

To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

With regard to safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, it is assessed that the retention of the existing planting along the eastern boundary of the site, together with new planting proposed as part of a landscape strategy, would provide an effective landscape boundary between this development and countryside to the east. Persimmon Homes objects that the grade of the site is 1,2 or 3a agricultural land value. We therefore request that the Council provides further information on how it has reached this conclusion.

This will be enhanced as the proposed planting matures so development on site could actively assist in safeguarding open countryside to the west. Consequently, this site does not meet this purpose of Green Belt land.

We would recommend that the Council:

- References that no Listed Buildings would be affected as the result of developing this site for housing.
- States that the site is available, suitable and achievable.
- States that the development of this site confirms with the Core Strategy and is a major settlement greenfield extension.
- Amends the overall sprawl conclusion that there would be no potential for unrestricted sprawl.
- Provides further information on the agricultural land classification assumption
- Amend the coalescence assessment, stating the site has a defensible boundary.
- Provides further information on what information it has used to rank the site.

Overall, taking into consideration the points above Persimmon Homes believes that this site meets the deliverability test of footnote 11 of the Framework, where it is considered to be suitable, available and achievable. Therefore, it is recommended that the Council amends the site to “green”.

See rep for full details

Representation ID: REP06784 Question Ref: H11

We consider that sites 1284A, 1284B and 1320 are available immediately for development. Therefore we consider development can be achieved on the sites in the short term i.e. within 5 years and leading into the medium to longer term.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1284B

Housing

Albert Drive - Low Moor Farm Extension, Morley

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Adam C Jones

Representor No: PRS00141

Representation ID: REP02214 Question Ref: H1

access road (Wide Lane) at capacity, sites available at South Parade and Chartists Way provides green barrier between the A653 and Morley

Name: Brian Guy

Representor No: PRS00142

Representation ID: REP04659 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Representation ID: REP00915 Question Ref: H1

1285 - Green to red. This is a protected site and should remain so. We have good farmland in Morley and that is how it should remain.

Name: R Louise Jones

Representor No: PRS00144

Representation ID: REP00918 Question Ref: H1

Green to Red. Road Access already at capacity. Sites available at South Parade and Chartist Way. Site provides a green barrier between A653 and Morley.

Name: Michael J Jones

Representor No: PRS00145

Representation ID: REP00919 Question Ref: H1

Green to red. Roads at capacity, sites available at South Parade and Chartist Way. The site is a welcome green barrier between A653 and Morley.

Representation ID: REP01820 Question Ref: H1

1285 - Green to red. Wide Lane already at capacity (peak times), sites available at South Parade and Chartists Way. Green barrier between A653 and Morley

Name: Ian Dickinson

Representor No: PRS00146

Representation ID: REP00920 Question Ref: H1

1285 - Green to red. Traffic problems at a maximum now. No possible solution to traffic problems on Wide Lane and schools a problem again.

Name: Janice Dickinson

Representor No: PRS00147

Representation ID: REP00921 Question Ref: H1

1285 - Green to red. Area already over built. Already too much traffic on Wide Lane, Dewsbury Road - no extra schools, doctors, set up etc.

Name: Wenda P Whitehead

Representor No: PRS00312

Representation ID: REP04786 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Janice Beever

Representor No: PRS00441

Representation ID: REP04791 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Name: Mavis & Geoff Pell

Representor No: PRS00594

Representation ID: REP02553 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: G Storey

Representor No: PRS00595

Representation ID: REP02578 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Margaret Middleton

Representor No: PRS00600

Representation ID: REP02585 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: A Farrelly

Representor No: PRS00601

Representation ID: REP02587 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Carnell

Representor No: PRS00603

Representation ID: REP02588 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: D C Hartley

Representor No: PRS00604

Representation ID: REP02590 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm _ Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Ryan Redmond

Representor No: PRS00633

Representation ID: REP02618 Question Ref: H1

1285 Ewlers Farm - Greeo to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: G Woodhead

Representor No: PRS00635

Representation ID: REP02620 Question Ref: H1

1285 Ewlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Robert Stephen Cheeseman

Representor No: PRS00636

Representation ID: REP02622 Question Ref: H1

1285 Ewlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Featherstone

Representor No: PRS00638

Representation ID: REP02623 Question Ref: H1

1285 Ewlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: J Payne

Representor No: PRS00639

Representation ID: REP02624 Question Ref: H1

1285 Ewlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: V Smith

Representor No: PRS00641

Representation ID: REP02625 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: M Thompson

Representor No: PRS00647

Representation ID: REP02628 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Robina O'Neill

Representor No: PRS00649

Representation ID: REP02633 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Roy Johnson

Representor No: PRS00650

Representation ID: REP02634 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Tom Rodi

Representor No: PRS00651

Representation ID: REP02635 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: C Beasley

Representor No: PRS00652

Representation ID: REP02636 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Natasha Dickenson

Representor No: PRS00653

Representation ID: REP02638 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Charlotte Robson

Representor No: PRS00654

Representation ID: REP02640 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Stephen Dixon

Representor No: PRS00658

Representation ID: REP02646 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: L Kilpatrick

Representor No: PRS00659

Representation ID: REP02647 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Julie Shaw

Representor No: PRS00660

Representation ID: REP02648 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Laura Pickup

Representor No: PRS00661

Representation ID: REP02649 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: E Megson

Representor No: PRS00662

Representation ID: REP02651 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: J Hanson

Representor No: PRS00663

Representation ID: REP02652 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: C H Knight

Representor No: PRS00664

Representation ID: REP02653 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Graham Cowell

Representor No: PRS00665

Representation ID: REP02654 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Paul King

Representor No: PRS00666

Representation ID: REP02655 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Gillian Welborn

Representor No: PRS00667

Representation ID: REP02658 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Vettraino Frank

Representor No: PRS00670

Representation ID: REP02662 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Sharon Calvert

Representor No: PRS00672

Representation ID: REP02663 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Madison Nice

Representor No: PRS00673

Representation ID: REP02665 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farn - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Elaine Payne

Representor No: PRS00674

Representation ID: REP02667 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Tracy Stanley

Representor No: PRS00676

Representation ID: REP02668 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Sarah Garfield

Representor No: PRS00678

Representation ID: REP02670 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Sharon Wilson

Representor No: PRS00681

Representation ID: REP02674 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Mandi Marchant

Representor No: PRS00684

Representation ID: REP02677 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Susan Bethell

Representor No: PRS00686

Representation ID: REP02679 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Susan Kellett

Representor No: PRS00687

Representation ID: REP02681 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Natalie Bentham

Representor No: PRS00689

Representation ID: REP02684 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: P Sams

Representor No: PRS00691

Representation ID: REP02686 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Ian Mortimer

Representor No: PRS00692

Representation ID: REP02687 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Lynne Jones

Representor No: PRS00694

Representation ID: REP02688 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Janet Ayres

Representor No: PRS00695

Representation ID: REP02689 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: James Thomas

Representor No: PRS00700

Representation ID: REP02701 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: S Bedford

Representor No: PRS00702

Representation ID: REP02702 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: C Kurij

Representor No: PRS00703

Representation ID: REP02704 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Rita & Simon Rumsey

Representor No: PRS00705

Representation ID: REP02705 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Stott Lisa

Representor No: PRS00708

Representation ID: REP02707 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Vicky Richardson

Representor No: PRS00710

Representation ID: REP02710 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: K King

Representor No: PRS00712

Representation ID: REP02712 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Sarah Turpin

Representor No: PRS00720

Representation ID: REP02723 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Zac Hewson

Representor No: PRS00722

Representation ID: REP02725 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Mark Sizer

Representor No: PRS00723

Representation ID: REP02726 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Rachel Dunning

Representor No: PRS00724

Representation ID: REP02728 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Geoffrey Wilkinson

Representor No: PRS00725

Representation ID: REP02729 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: S Elliott

Representor No: PRS00726

Representation ID: REP02730 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Nicola Armitage

Representor No: PRS00727

Representation ID: REP02732 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Jack Cooper

Representor No: PRS00729

Representation ID: REP02734 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: P Perkins

Representor No: PRS00730

Representation ID: REP02735 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: M Potts

Representor No: PRS00731

Representation ID: REP02736 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Sally Smith

Representor No: PRS00748

Representation ID: REP02755 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: B C Mosby

Representor No: PRS00749

Representation ID: REP02757 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Gwen Lovett

Representor No: PRS00750

Representation ID: REP02759 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: C Calvert

Representor No: PRS00752

Representation ID: REP02760 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Julie Ruan

Representor No: PRS00753

Representation ID: REP02762 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Susan Jackson

Representor No: PRS00755

Representation ID: REP02764 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Charlotte Harrison

Representor No: PRS00758

Representation ID: REP02766 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Marian Banica

Representor No: PRS00762

Representation ID: REP02771 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: D Durnell

Representor No: PRS00763

Representation ID: REP02775 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Alan Benn

Representor No: PRS00766

Representation ID: REP02777 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Sue Dalby

Representor No: PRS00769

Representation ID: REP02781 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Angela Mccarthy

Representor No: PRS00772

Representation ID: REP02782 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Avril Corker

Representor No: PRS00774

Representation ID: REP02784 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Maureen Rosindale

Representor No: PRS00776

Representation ID: REP02787 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Lorraine Best

Representor No: PRS00777

Representation ID: REP02788 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: S Ashworth

Representor No: PRS00788

Representation ID: REP02799 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Mandy Lyman

Representor No: PRS00789

Representation ID: REP02801 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Annabelle Beevers

Representor No: PRS00791

Representation ID: REP02802 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red
Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion
Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Representation ID: REP02964 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red
Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion
Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Geoffrey Pell

Representor No: PRS00793

Representation ID: REP02803 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Janet King

Representor No: PRS00794

Representation ID: REP02805 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: P Ambler

Representor No: PRS00797

Representation ID: REP02806 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: M Wilson

Representor No: PRS00799

Representation ID: REP02809 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Barbara Hinsliff

Representor No: PRS00801

Representation ID: REP02813 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Brenda Haigh

Representor No: PRS00803

Representation ID: REP02815 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green top Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Thomas O'Neill

Representor No: PRS00805

Representation ID: REP02817 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Barrie C Short

Representor No: PRS00812

Representation ID: REP02824 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Melville Hopwood

Representor No: PRS00819

Representation ID: REP02832 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Steven Ivankiv

Representor No: PRS00822

Representation ID: REP02836 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: J Holliday

Representor No: PRS00823

Representation ID: REP02837 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Peter Matthews

Representor No: PRS00824

Representation ID: REP02839 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Susan Richards

Representor No: PRS00825

Representation ID: REP02840 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Sarah Rimmer

Representor No: PRS00826

Representation ID: REP02841 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Davan Moore

Representor No: PRS00827

Representation ID: REP02842 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: A Ivankiv

Representor No: PRS00828

Representation ID: REP02843 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Beryl Pearce

Representor No: PRS00833

Representation ID: REP02848 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: M Stanley

Representor No: PRS00834

Representation ID: REP02849 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Jean Garforth

Representor No: PRS00835

Representation ID: REP02850 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Janet Wainwright

Representor No: PRS00836

Representation ID: REP02851 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Steve Wynn

Representor No: PRS00838

Representation ID: REP02853 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Joseph Bray

Representor No: PRS00839

Representation ID: REP02854 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: K Ramsden

Representor No: PRS00840

Representation ID: REP02855 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Name: P S Barrie

Representor No: PRS00915

Representation ID: REP04769 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Representation ID: REP04810 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Representation ID: REP04781 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Greenwood

Representor No: PRS00917

Representation ID: REP02946 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Mavis Scott

Representor No: PRS00918

Representation ID: REP02947 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm - Green to Red
Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion
Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Name: Lynne Paul

Representor No: PRS01169

Representation ID: REP04800 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Name: D Paul

Representor No: PRS01183

Representation ID: REP04793 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Representation ID: REP08289 Question Ref: H1

1285 -

Once again ill thought out and totally unsuitable developers ignore the local people who pay Council Tax. This development will put extra traffic on to the A653 which is bad at present taking into account the extension to the White Rose centre it's madness. No schools with places no health centres near by it means using cars which create traffic or can you not see that problem.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: B Stringer

Representor No: PRS01606

Representation ID: REP04797 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Name: L.e Beever

Representor No: PRS01607

Representation ID: REP04804 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Name: J Cowie

Representor No: PRS02227

Representation ID: REP04768 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Name: Susan Holt

Representor No: PRS02289

Representation ID: REP04772 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Name: Dereck Holt

Representor No: PRS02311

Representation ID: REP04766 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Name: Jenni Davenport

Representor No: PRS02330

Representation ID: REP04770 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Frank Raven

Representor No: PRS02339

Representation ID: REP04771 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Name: E Naylor

Representor No: PRS02363

Representation ID: REP04780 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Name: Kathleen Paver

Representor No: PRS02372

Representation ID: REP04774 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Name: C Guy

Representor No: PRS02377

Representation ID: REP04767 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Name: C Clegg

Representor No: PRS02406

Representation ID: REP04663 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Name: Doreen Gill

Representor No: PRS02496

Representation ID: REP04755 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: D Naylor

Representor No: PRS02497

Representation ID: REP04773 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Name: A Paver

Representor No: PRS02498

Representation ID: REP04775 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Name: James Bowers

Representor No: PRS02500

Representation ID: REP04777 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Name: Alan Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02501

Representation ID: REP04778 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Name: Vivienne Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02502

Representation ID: REP04779 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Name: Vivian Oxtoby

Representor No: PRS02504

Representation ID: REP04783 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Beryl Hewitt

Representor No: PRS02506

Representation ID: REP04785 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Name: D A Clegg

Representor No: PRS02507

Representation ID: REP04788 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Name: Pauline Wood

Representor No: PRS02508

Representation ID: REP04790 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Name: Joyce Thompson

Representor No: PRS02510

Representation ID: REP04792 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Name: Patricia Aston

Representor No: PRS02513

Representation ID: REP04796 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Name: L. G Wilson

Representor No: PRS02515

Representation ID: REP04799 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: S Laurence

Representor No: PRS02517

Representation ID: REP04801 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Name: C Graham

Representor No: PRS02518

Representation ID: REP04803 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Name: M Allsop

Representor No: PRS02520

Representation ID: REP04805 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Name: R Hartill

Representor No: PRS02521

Representation ID: REP04806 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Name: Edith Holmes

Representor No: PRS02522

Representation ID: REP04808 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Name: Harry Holmes

Representor No: PRS02524

Representation ID: REP04811 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Ann Morse

Representor No: PRS02526

Representation ID: REP04813 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Name: L.r Morse

Representor No: PRS02527

Representation ID: REP04816 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Name: Michael Hartill

Representor No: PRS02556

Representation ID: REP04847 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Name: Jim Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02561

Representation ID: REP04852 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Name: Helen Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02562

Representation ID: REP04855 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Name: Ronald Gill

Representor No: PRS02564

Representation ID: REP04858 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: A.w Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02565

Representation ID: REP04859 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Name: J Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02566

Representation ID: REP04860 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Name: Norman Dearden

Representor No: PRS02568

Representation ID: REP04857 Question Ref: H1

1285 Owlers Farm, Site Capacity 100, Ward Morley South

This site is accessed from Wide Lane, a road which does not live up to its name and is extremely congested at peak times. Road links to Morley are slow and to Leeds involve using the A653 which is busy especially at peak times; the use of a merge lane at the roundabout junction of Wide Lane and Dewsbury Road exacerbates the difficulties. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition. This site acts as a green break between Morley and Middleton.

Name: Richard Marshall

Representor No: PRS03170

Representation ID: REP01024 Question Ref: H5

1079, 1072, 1077, 1143B, 1143D, 1171B, 1200A, 1258, 1284a, 1285, 1344, 2098a, 3365, 3456A.2098C, 2105, 2155, 3000, 3056,3064, 3078A, 4004, and 4029. As previously stated the amber sites that are greenbelt land should not be considered for development. Site 1032 is designated as a protected area of search this land has been retained along the edge of the existing settlement pending more suitable sites being found in the longer term this site should only be developed as a last resort.

Representation ID: REP01024 Question Ref: H2

1079, 1072, 1077, 1143B, 1143D, 1171B, 1200A, 1258, 1284a, 1285, 1344, 2098a, 3365, 3456A. All these sites are green belt sites , green belt land is there to stop urban sprawl and the destruction of the countryside that still remains in this area. If sites 1143B, 1143D, 1143F,2155, 1274, 1032, and 2128 are built on East Ardsley West Ardsley and Tingley will just become one built up area hemmed in by the M62. Not all of these are greenbelt sites but if the development is allowed the basic principal of having greenbelt in this area will be completely wrecked!

Name: Mark Houston

Representor No: PRS04641

Representation ID: REP00006 Question Ref: H11

1285, 1282 and 1171B should all be considered short

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Persimmon Homes

Representor No: PRS05691

Representation ID: REP06938 Question Ref: H1

Site 1285

We support the identification of site 1285 as a "Green Site".

We support the identification of the site as light green in terms of the assessment. The site meets the relevant Framework tests as set out at footnote 11 in that the site is suitable and available thereby making development on the site achievable. A planning application is currently being considered for the site and this shows the intrinsic interest of the site.

We support the site assessment which concludes that the site is free from constraint. In particular the site is well related to the settlement of Morley and therefore broadly accords with the emerging Core Strategy.

We would recommend that the Council:

- ☐ Clarifies how it has assessed the distance to the rail station and bus stop.
- ☐ States that the site is available, suitable and achievable.
- ☐ States that the development of this site conforms with the Core Strategy and is a major settlement greenfield extension.
- ☐ Provides further information on the agricultural land classification assumption.
- ☐ Provides further information on what information it has used to rank the site.

See rep for full details.

Representation ID: REP06938 Question Ref: H11

Site 1285 is available immediately for development. We consider that development can be achieved on the sites in the short term i.e. within 5 years and leading into the medium to longer term.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 4 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' and 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network.

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network)

From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service frequency levels.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites - green sites are linked to this comment]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H1

Disagree with Council's green assessment, think the site should be amber

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1285

Housing

Owlers Farm PAS , Wide Lane, Morley

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H1

Disagree with Council's green assessment, think the site should be amber

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1319

Housing

Albert Road (land north of), Morley

Name: Stephen Jones

Representor No: PRS00134

Representation ID: REP00906 Question Ref: H1

1319 - Green to red [[[site indicated is amber]]]
no capacity on local roads (and services).
Green space for local leisure and wildlife.

Name: Adam C Jones

Representor No: PRS00141

Representation ID: REP02214 Question Ref: H4

no capacity in local roads and services. Much needed green space for wildlife

Name: Brian Guy

Representor No: PRS00142

Representation ID: REP04659 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05028 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05028 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Name: R Louise Jones

Representor No: PRS00144

Representation ID: REP00918 Question Ref: H1

Green to Red. No capacity in local services, local roads at capacity. The site is much needed green space, wildlife and horses provided for.

Name: Michael J Jones

Representor No: PRS00145

Representation ID: REP00919 Question Ref: H1

No capacity on access road. Other derelict sites available in Morley. Treasured local greenspace.

Name: Wenda P Whitehead

Representor No: PRS00312

Representation ID: REP04786 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05048 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05048 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1319

Housing

Albert Road (land north of), Morley

Name: Janice Beever

Representor No: PRS00441

Representation ID: REP04791 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05051 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05051 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Name: P S Barrie

Representor No: PRS00915

Representation ID: REP04769 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP04810 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP04781 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05064 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05045 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05034 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05064 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05045 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05034 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Name: Lynne Paul

Representor No: PRS01169

Representation ID: REP04800 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05057 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05057 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1319

Housing

Albert Road (land north of), Morley

Name: D Paul

Representor No: PRS01183

Representation ID: REP04793 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05053 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05053 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Name: B Stringer

Representor No: PRS01606

Representation ID: REP04797 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05055 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05055 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Name: L.e Beever

Representor No: PRS01607

Representation ID: REP04804 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05060 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05060 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1319

Housing

Albert Road (land north of), Morley

Name: Alan Haigh

Representor No: PRS01638

Representation ID: REP03792 Question Ref: H1

563 / 1284A / 1320 -

Leeds LDF Draft Housing Site Allocations.

I have studied the draft proposals for housing in the areas where we live and frequently use.

The proposals are considered to be excessive for such a small area and Morley seems to be taking a disproportionate amount of development. We have already had some poor planning in our area with over development and a lack of facilities such as open spaces and loss of footpaths.

There should therefore be no major development on our green belt. Instead any housing should be on brown field land or infill sites. These should be linked to improving our poor environment.

I attach a table and sketch map showing common sense counter proposals for this area. This shows that 397 houses could be built in our area linked to an improvement in our local facilities such as access to green spaces, cycleways and footpaths plus better links to our railway station which is due to be electrified.

Our area needs to be comprehensively planned to improve the area as a whole where everything links together rather than piecemeal planning.

I trust that these will be very carefully considered by the Council.

Yours faithfully,

[Table and map scanned]

My comments on individual sites:

Site no.	No.units	Object or support	Remarks
126	116	object	This site is an eyesore and should be cleared.
Housing should then be built on the site incorporating a high quality footpath and cycleway. The only way that we can resolve this problem area is through development.			
563	40	support	
1280		support	Station Road park. Although this is neglected it is a valuable open space and should not be built on
1282		object	Valuable green belt should remain untouched,
1284A	44	support	Fringe of built up area
1319	75	object	This has no public access to the site and is untidy and neglected. Houses should therefore be built on it which if done competently would vastly improve the site with improved access to the railway station and green spaces to the east. It is the old Morley Main colliery site and any development should include marker and also a memorial to all the miners who died in the Morley Main Colliery disaster.
1320		object	Valuable green open space
3428	22	support	
338/531	100		Daisy Hill with planning permission
Total 387			

Name: J Cowie

Representor No: PRS02227

Representation ID: REP04768 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South

Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05033 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05033 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1319

Housing

Albert Road (land north of), Morley

Name: Susan Holt

Representor No: PRS02289

Representation ID: REP04772 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05037 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05037 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Name: Dereck Holt

Representor No: PRS02311

Representation ID: REP04766 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05031 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05031 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Name: Jenni Davenport

Representor No: PRS02330

Representation ID: REP04770 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05035 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05035 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Name: Frank Raven

Representor No: PRS02339

Representation ID: REP04771 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05036 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05036 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1319

Housing

Albert Road (land north of), Morley

Name: E Naylor

Representor No: PRS02363

Representation ID: REP04780 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05044 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05044 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Name: Kathleen Paver

Representor No: PRS02372

Representation ID: REP04774 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05039 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05039 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Name: C Guy

Representor No: PRS02377

Representation ID: REP04767 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05032 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05032 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Name: C Clegg

Representor No: PRS02406

Representation ID: REP04663 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05029 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05029 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1319

Housing

Albert Road (land north of), Morley

Name: Doreen Gill

Representor No: PRS02496

Representation ID: REP04755 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05030 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05030 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Name: D Naylor

Representor No: PRS02497

Representation ID: REP04773 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05038 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05038 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Name: A Paver

Representor No: PRS02498

Representation ID: REP04775 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05040 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05040 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Name: James Bowers

Representor No: PRS02500

Representation ID: REP04777 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05041 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05041 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1319

Housing

Albert Road (land north of), Morley

Name: Alan Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02501

Representation ID: REP04778 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05042 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05042 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Name: Vivienne Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02502

Representation ID: REP04779 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05043 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05043 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Name: Vivian Oxtoby

Representor No: PRS02504

Representation ID: REP04783 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05046 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05046 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Name: Beryl Hewitt

Representor No: PRS02506

Representation ID: REP04785 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05047 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05047 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1319

Housing

Albert Road (land north of), Morley

Name: D A Clegg

Representor No: PRS02507

Representation ID: REP04788 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05049 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05049 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Name: Pauline Wood

Representor No: PRS02508

Representation ID: REP04790 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05050 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05050 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Name: Joyce Thompson

Representor No: PRS02510

Representation ID: REP04792 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05052 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05052 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Name: Patricia Aston

Representor No: PRS02513

Representation ID: REP04796 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05054 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05054 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1319

Housing

Albert Road (land north of), Morley

Name: L. G Wilson

Representor No: PRS02515

Representation ID: REP04799 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05056 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05056 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Name: S Laurence

Representor No: PRS02517

Representation ID: REP04801 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05058 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05058 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Name: C Graham

Representor No: PRS02518

Representation ID: REP04803 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05059 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05059 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Name: M Allsop

Representor No: PRS02520

Representation ID: REP04805 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05061 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05061 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1319

Housing

Albert Road (land north of), Morley

Name: R Hartill

Representor No: PRS02521

Representation ID: REP04806 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05062 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05062 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Name: Edith Holmes

Representor No: PRS02522

Representation ID: REP04808 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05063 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05063 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Name: Harry Holmes

Representor No: PRS02524

Representation ID: REP04811 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05065 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05065 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Name: Ann Morse

Representor No: PRS02526

Representation ID: REP04813 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05066 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05066 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1319

Housing

Albert Road (land north of), Morley

Name: L.r Morse

Representor No: PRS02527

Representation ID: REP04816 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05067 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05067 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Name: Michael Hartill

Representor No: PRS02556

Representation ID: REP04847 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05068 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05068 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Name: Jim Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02561

Representation ID: REP04852 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05069 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05069 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Name: Helen Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02562

Representation ID: REP04855 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05070 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05070 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1319

Housing

Albert Road (land north of), Morley

Name: Ronald Gill

Representor No: PRS02564

Representation ID: REP04858 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05072 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05072 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Name: A.w Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02565

Representation ID: REP04859 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05073 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05073 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Name: J Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02566

Representation ID: REP04860 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05074 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05074 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Name: Norman Dearden

Representor No: PRS02568

Representation ID: REP04857 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 1319 North of Albert Road, Capacity 75, Ward Morley South
Would round off existing settlement. Concerns regarding infrastructure apply to this site as to all the others.

Representation ID: REP05071 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05071 Question Ref: G14

Site ref 1319 could be released for housing.

Name: Jacqueline Squire

Representor No: PRS04321

Representation ID: REP00393 Question Ref: G14

Not familiar with this area

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1319

Housing

Albert Road (land north of), Morley

Name: Kcs Developments Limited KCS Developments Limited

Representor No: PRS06124

Representation ID: REP06996 Question Ref: H3

1319 - objection to amber. Should be green.

2.4 In the 'Outer South West Housing Market Characteristic Area', we consider that 'Land to the North of Albert Road, Morley' (Site Ref 1318) should be identified as 'Green' because it is one of the most suitable sites for allocation for housing.

2.5 Our client is proposing to provide a residential scheme consisting of approximately 70 dwellings. This would consist of a mix of dwelling types and tenures with an emphasis on family housing. The housing mix would reflect the Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2011). The proposal would also provide an element of affordable housing.

2.6 The site is 2.5 hectares in size and is located on the eastern side of Morley. The site has frontage directly onto Albert Road. The site currently consists of low quality grassland, which is split into a number of individual paddocks. The site was formerly used for mining and was subsequently backfilled as part of the remediation of the land. Therefore, the SHLAA correctly identifies the site as previously developed.

2.7 The surrounding area comprises of a mixture of residential and commercial developments. However, the area is predominately residential in character. The site is bordered by residential development to the east and south, to the west by an industrial estate, and to the north by a strip of woodland. An industrial depot is situated beyond the woodland to the north.

2.8 As shown, the site is bounded on three sides by built development. The site is clearly well related to the existing pattern of development and would represent the efficient use of previously developed land. The development of the site would not extend the built form and would represent an appropriate infill development within the urban area.

2.9 Albert Road and the neighbouring highway network have sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposed development without harming highway safety and efficiency. It is noted that the Council has no objections to the proposal in this regard. Equally, an Intrusive Site Investigation has been carried out which concluded that there was minimal contamination of the site. Therefore, there are no insurmountable obstacles to the development of the site and it is fully deliverable in accordance with paragraph 47 of the NPPF. Equally, having reviewed the other green and amber rated sites in the 'Outer South West', it is considered that Site 1319 represents one of the most appropriate sites for allocation when considered reasonable alternatives.

2.10 We are conscious of the considerations set out in Policy SP6 in the Core Strategy (CS) as outlined in the introductory Chapter to these representations. Dealing with those provisions in turn,

i. Whether the proposal is a Sustainable location, which is supported by existing or access to new facilities and services.

2.11 Site 1319 is located within Morley, which is identified as a 'major settlement' in the settlement hierarchy, and therefore is intrinsically a sustainable location for development.

The site is within reasonable walking distance to bus and rail services and is accessible to employment opportunities, retail and recreation facilities including Morley town centre, primary and secondary schools, and local shops. Therefore, it is considered that the site is

in a highly sustainable and accessible location in accordance with draft Policy T2 in the emerging Core Strategy.

ii. Preference for brownfield and regeneration sites.

2.12 The Council's assessment identifies that the site constitutes previously developed land. Therefore the site should be a high priority for allocation in accordance with paragraph 17 of the NPPF, which seeks to encourage the effective use of previously developed land.

iii. The least impact on Green Belt purposes

2.13 The site is not located in the Green Belt.

iv. Opportunities to reinforce or enhance the distinctiveness of existing neighbourhoods and quality of life of local communities through the design and standard of new homes.

2.14 We consider that the site is suitable for a development of high quality family housing. This would help to meet a local need for family housing and diversify the local housing stock.

The scheme would incorporate a landscape buffer along its western boundary to hide the neighbouring industrial estate. It should also be noted that our client has commissioned a Noise Assessment, which determined that the noise levels from the neighbouring industrial estate and depot would not unduly compromise the residential amenity of any future occupiers of the site.

v) The need for realistic lead in times and build out rates for housing construction

2.15 The site is available. It is wholly within the ownership of our client who is committed to bringing the site forward for housing development. It is considered that there would be a minimal lead in time and the development could be built out within a 3 - 4 year period.

vi) The least negative and most positive impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation.

2.16 It is recognised that the site is designated as Green Space in the UDP. However the site is privately owned and there are no public rights of way across the land. The site is used as paddocks and does not have any public amenity or recreational value. The site is heavily grazed and therefore has little or no biodiversity value.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1319

Housing

Albert Road (land north of), Morley

Name: Kcs Developments Limited KCS Developments Limited

Representor No: PRS06124

2.17 The only issue is the visual contribution the site makes to the quality of the townscape. It is recognised that the construction of new homes on the site would change the character of the site from being open to one with built development. However, the site is not of any special landscape merit and makes little contribution to the character of the surrounding area. The extent of any impact would be limited by the proposed layout and landscaping. The proposed landscaping on the road frontage would significantly soften the impact of the development on the wider views.

2.18 The Open Space Audit has identified Site 1319 as unsuitable for continued designation as a Greenspace and therefore it is proposed to delete the allocation. Furthermore, the Council's own assessment identifies that there is a surplus of natural greenspace within north Morley. Consequently, we consider that there is no justification for not identifying Site 1319 as 'GREEN' in the Site Appraisal because the greenspace designation is clearly no longer relevant or appropriate.

vii) Generally avoiding or mitigating areas of flood risk

2.19 The site is not within a flood risk zone, and site run-off will be mitigated through a SUDS drainage scheme.

2.20 In accordance with Paragraph 47 of the NPPF, Site 1319 is fully deliverable as it is available now, offers a suitable location for development now, and is achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and the development is entirely viable. There are no flood risk or contamination issues on the site. The proposal would deliver significant public benefits particularly in regards to delivering affordable housing. Based on the above, we consider that the site is available, suitable and achievable should therefore should be categorised as 'GREEN'.

Representation ID: REP06996 Question Ref: H4

1319 - objection to amber. Should be green.

For the reasons set out above, we consider that Site 1319 should be identified as 'Green' because it has the greatest potential for allocation for housing.

Representation ID: REP06996 Question Ref: H11

1319

We do not consider that housing sites should be phased over particular periods of the Core Strategy, as this is a matter for the market to determine. However as demonstrated Site 1319 is fully deliverable and therefore could come forward in the first five years of the Local Plan period.

Representation ID: REP07006 Question Ref: G1

Housing site 1319 - greenspace should be deleted

We consider that the UDP N1 greenspace designation on Site 1319 should be deleted. Site 1319 fulfils no greenspace function, which is recognised in the Council's Open Space Audit. The site is privately owned and there are no public rights of way across the land and therefore it does not have any public amenity or recreational value. Furthermore, the Open Space Audit identifies that there is a surplus of Natural Green Space within Morley and as such, the retention of the site as Greenspace is unnecessary

Representation ID: REP07006 Question Ref: G14

Site 1319 'Land north of Albert Road, Morley' should be released for housing. The Open Space Audit has identified that the site fulfils no greenspace function and should no longer be retained for this purpose. As previously stated, the site comprises of low quality grassland, which has no intrinsic landscape value and makes a limited visual contribution to the settlement.

2.38 Furthermore, the site is in private ownership and therefore there is no prospect of the land being brought into beneficial use as greenspace in the future. Instead, the site should be released for housing given that it is located in a highly sustainable location.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1319

Housing

Albert Road (land north of), Morley

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H4

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Amber Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are be minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H4

Agree with amber allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H4

Agree with amber allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1320

Housing

Albert Drive - Lower Moor Farm PAS, Morley

Name: Stephen Jones

Representor No: PRS00134

Representation ID: REP00906 Question Ref: H1

1320 - Green to Red
Poor access past existing homes to roads at capacity.
No capacity in local services.

Name: Adam C Jones

Representor No: PRS00141

Representation ID: REP00916 Question Ref: H1

Green to Red. Poor road access past existing family homes to roads at capacity. No capacity in local services e.g.schools

Name: R Louise Jones

Representor No: PRS00144

Representation ID: REP00918 Question Ref: H1

Green to Red. Too many houses, poor road access past existing family homes to road already at capacity. No capacity in local services e.g, schools

Name: Michael J Jones

Representor No: PRS00145

Representation ID: REP00919 Question Ref: H1

Green to red. Poor road access past existing family homes to roads already at capacity at peak times. No capacity in local services e.g. schools, doctors

Name: Alan Sheard

Representor No: PRS00179

Representation ID: REP02106 Question Ref: H1

1320 - Green to amber. Green space for nearby residents, various events held on this land, was colliery waste tip, possible subsidence and methane gas.

Name: Neil Sheard

Representor No: PRS00656

Representation ID: REP02643 Question Ref: H1

1320 Albert St Morley. Green to Amber.

Only green space in area which is used for events. Was used a waste tip by Morley Main Pit. Could have Methane gas leakage and subsidance.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1320

Housing

Albert Drive - Lower Moor Farm PAS, Morley

Name: Alan Haigh

Representor No: PRS01638

Representation ID: REP03792 Question Ref: H1

563 / 1284A / 1320 -

Leeds LDF Draft Housing Site Allocations.

I have studied the draft proposals for housing in the areas where we live and frequently use.

The proposals are considered to be excessive for such a small area and Morley seems to be taking a disproportionate amount of development. We have already had some poor planning in our area with over development and a lack of facilities such as open spaces and loss of footpaths.

There should therefore be no major development on our green belt. Instead any housing should be on brown field land or infill sites. These should be linked to improving our poor environment.

I attach a table and sketch map showing common sense counter proposals for this area. This shows that 397 houses could be built in our area linked to an improvement in our local facilities such as access to green spaces, cycleways and footpaths plus better links to our railway station which is due to be electrified.

Our area needs to be comprehensively planned to improve the area as a whole where everything links together rather than piecemeal planning.

I trust that these will be very carefully considered by the Council.

Yours faithfully,

[Table and map scanned]

My comments on individual sites:

Site no.	No.units	Object or support	Remarks
126	116	object	This site is an eyesore and should be cleared.
Housing should then be built on the site incorporating a high quality footpath and cycleway. The only way that we can resolve this problem area is through development.			
563	40	support	
1280		support	Station Road park. Although this is neglected it is a valuable open space and should not be built on
1282		object	Valuable green belt should remain untouched,
1284A	44	support	Fringe of built up area
1319	75	object	This has no public access to the site and is untidy and neglected. Houses should therefore be built on it which if done competently would vastly improve the site with improved access to the railway station and green spaces to the east. It is the old Morley Main colliery site and any development should include marker and also a memorial to all the miners who died in the Morley Main Colliery disaster.
1320		object	Valuable green open space
3428	22	support	
338/531	100		Daisy Hill with planning permission
Total 387			

Name: Persimmon Homes

Representor No: PRS05691

Representation ID: REP06784 Question Ref: H1

Whilst Persimmon Homes are supportive of the identification of 1320 for allocation, the following points need to be addressed by the Council:

- Site Details
- Distances - The Council should make clear at what point / route it has used in identifying the distance to a rail station and bus stop.
- Conformity with Core Strategy – The site is well related to a major settlement and would be a major settlement greenfield extension.

Persimmon Homes objects that the grade of the site is 1.2 or 3a agricultural land value. We therefore request that the Council provides further information on how it has reached this conclusion.

We would recommend that the Council:

- States that the development of this site confirms with the Core Strategy and is a major settlement greenfield extension.
- Provides further information on the agricultural land classification assumption
- Provides further information on what information it has used to rank the site.

See rep for full details.

Representation ID: REP06784 Question Ref: H11

We consider that sites 1284A, 1284B and 1320 are available immediately for development. Therefore we consider development can be achieved on the sites in the short term i.e. within 5 years and leading into the medium to longer term.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1320

Housing

Albert Drive - Lower Moor Farm PAS, Morley

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 4 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' and 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network.

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network)

From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service frequency levels.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites - green sites are linked to this comment]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H1

Disagree with Council's green assessment, think the site should be amber

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H1

Disagree with Council's green assessment, think the site should be amber

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1325

Housing

Dewsbury Road (501) LS11 5LL

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network. From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1330A

Housing

Haigh Moor Road - Jude's Point, West Ardsley, WF3 1EF Plan App 12/01850/RM

Name: Annie McNally

Representor No: PRS03059

Representation ID: REP00387 Question Ref: G1

I think it is disgusting that the council are wanting to build on greenbelt land on proposed Plots 1336, 3373, 3372, 3373A, 3373B, 3373C, 1330B, 1330A, 536. And 3456A. It is an area of outstanding beauty where people enjoy walking, running, playing and riding horses. Many wild animals live in the fields and to take it away would turn this area into a concrete jungle. It would mean my view at the back would be eradicated, lowering the value of my house, but more importantly the pleasure I have everyday when I look across the field. This city needs green areas where we can walk and get away from the stresses of life. Also, to the rear of my property there is bindweed in the field which I believe would make it difficult for any developers to be able to build on that land. There are plenty of brown field sites which can be developed. Do not take away our green spaces. Totally outrageous.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1330B

Housing

Haigh Moor Road - Jude's Point, West Ardsley, WF3 1EF

Name: J Vaughan

Representor No: PRS00152

Representation ID: REP01822 Question Ref: H1

1330B - Green to red. There is already a large amount of new building in the area and already congested (and exceedingly badly maintained) roads, schools and other services cannot cope. As there seem to be hundreds of empty flats in the city centre, I question the necessity of so much more new housing!

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1330B

Housing

Haigh Moor Road - Jude's Point, West Ardsley, WF3 1EF

Name: Anne Smith

Representor No: PRS00911

Representation ID: REP04561 Question Ref: H1

1330B Jude's Pond, Haigh Moor Road, West Ardsley. Change from Green to Red. The site is already part developed - enough! I refer to the consultation on the Leeds Local Plan and wish to object to the allocation of land in Tingley in the Outer South West document. My primary objection is to site 3373A, but the points raised are equally applicable to site 3373B, 1336 & 13308.

I appreciate the need for Leeds Council to provide for sufficient land to meet its housing requirements through the plan period. However, Para 151 of the NPPF requires that such allocations deliver sustainable development as this is the prime objective of the planning system that underpins the core principles of the planning system. I believe that these allocations fail to provide sustainable development for the following reasons, and so should be deleted from the plan:

Accessibility to Services

It is a core principle of the NPPF that development should be located where it has a good access to services to minimise the need for regular travel to those services by less sustainable methods. One of the core principles in Para 17 states that plan-making should 'actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable.'

The area around the allocations has a limited availability to services, with those that exists being local scale (corner food shops) or near to capacity (Westerton Primary school). All other services that are necessary for residential development are located beyond walking or cycling distance where access to them is only really achievable by car. This is not sustainable development.

The nearest existing supermarket to the allocations is at Morley which is over 2km from the site. The nearest neighbourhood centre allocated in the Outer South West plan is at Ardsley West which is also over 2km, but in the opposite direction so preventing any linked trips to these destinations. There is no community centre, sporting facilities, parks, cinema, etc.

When looking at access to employment opportunities the position is no better as the nearest concentrations of employment is over 1.5km distant, but is not safely accessible to the sites as it located across the M62 motorway. Indeed, the Outer South West plan identifies 14 sites within Ardsley and Robin Hood as having 'greatest potential for housing' and notes 7 other existing permissions/allocations, yet there is not a single existing or proposed employment site in the ward.

Surely this cannot be the coordinated development as is required to deliver the economic role of sustainable development that described in Para 7 of the NPPF, and so will also impact on the ability of the site's to demonstrate the social and environmental roles demanded by that Para.

Urban Form

The allocations will essentially close a gap that currently exists between the development around Westerton Road and that around Haigh Moor Road. These are distinct areas and the open land between them is a notable feature that is appreciated by the residents of both areas, and those traveling between them using either Baghill Road or Haigh Moor Road. These allocations will close that gap and so coalesce these settlements to the detriment of the identity of both. Development on the scale envisaged, particularly when combined with other development sites, does not "respect the character and objectives of local communities" (quote from paragraph 8.4 of Plan Overview.)

The retention of a narrow strip between these areas (allocation 3373B) will serve little benefit in preventing this coalescence as it is simply too narrow, and is in a natural dip where it will not be seen in views from the existing settlements. Instead these views will be taken up by the urban development on the two allocations which, due to their position on the slopes of the valley, will inevitably be the scene from all aspects in and around the area.

Wildlife Loss

Whilst the land is largely used and so managed for agriculture, and so of lesser wildlife importance, its margins and trees/hedgerows will be utilised by a range of species. It will also offer important foraging and commuting habitat for locally important species including foxes and bats and its development will therefore reduce their habitat. In turn this reduces the benefit of retaining site 3373B which I note your document explains is as it offers an attractive local resource for walkers and cyclists.

Agricultural Land

The land is designated as Grade 3 in the Natural England MAGIC website classification, albeit that this is based on a higher level and dated assessment. In the 28 years that I have overlooked the site it has always been farmed for crops, except in occasional fallow years. In reality I believe that this regular use for productive agriculture, the gentle sloping nature of the site to assist its drainage, and its south facing aspect will mean that the land of site 3373A is actually Grade 3a or even Grade 2. These grades are Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land that is protected from development by Para 112 of the NPPF.

The retention of such land is becoming increasingly critical due to the role that it plays toward delivering national food security and to reduce the distances travelled and so environmental impact of providing food. In addition, anaerobic digestion and other such energy production methods will become increasingly important in the future to national energy security. In turn this means that agricultural land will be required to provide fuel for these energy production methods. Areas of Best and Most Versatile agricultural land should be retained wherever possible as their higher quality ensures that they are better able to be flexibly farmed meet these needs.

Scale of Development

Throughout the NPPF it references the important role that communities have to play, with Para 1 stating that plans should 'reflect the needs and priorities of their communities'. The area around Westerton Road has seen extensive areas of residential development in the past 28 years, with that continuing with the development by Redraw Homes off Haigh Moor Road. There is clearly an argument that the area has accepted its fair share of development in recent years. The implications of further development in the area would be an increase in the population at a time when the services to support them are not available. InPhasing

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1330B

Housing

Haigh Moor Road - Jude's Point, West Ardsley, WF3 1EF

Name: Anne Smith

Representor No: PRS00911

If it is decided that one or both of sites 3373A and 3373C are to be allocated then I request that they are phased for development in the later years of the plan. This would have twin benefits in allowing the recent growth in the area to be accommodated within the community and services to be established to support it, and would allow previously developed allocations and windfall sites to be developed first. Without that phasing the volume house builders in the market will inevitably take such greenfield sites forward as they are easier and so offer greater returns. This would not demonstrate the primacy of the plan-led system as required by Para 8.13.

Highway Capacity

An increase in housing in this area would only add to traffic problems along the A650 the A653 and other minor roads when there is an accident on the M62 when drivers try to find an alternative route.

Highway Safety

I note the intention to serve site 3373A by a single access point, being Upper Green Drive to Upper Green Avenue to meet Westerton Road opposite the primary school and then on via other routes to the main highway network. I cannot believe that a single access point is sufficient to service this number of properties, and cannot accept that the point at which it meets Westerton Road is appropriate.

Summary

I do not believe that the residential development of sites 3373A and 3373C would be sustainable development required by NPPF and so I ask that they be omitted from the Plan. If they are to be retained I request that they be phased to prevent development for a period of say 15 years to allow the community to become settled from recent growth, new services and employment opportunities to be developed and to allow the development of sequentially preferable brownfield sites elsewhere in the city.

I trust that these comments assist your consideration of the future housing allocations in this area. Please add my details to your consultation list so that I can be advised of any future consultation exercises of this nature.

Name: David Ian Sanderson

Representor No: PRS01000

Representation ID: REP03038 Question Ref: H1

1330B

Name: David Eyles

Representor No: PRS01002

Representation ID: REP03049 Question Ref: H1

1330b, 3373a Tingley - Green to Red

Surface water, flooding, ecological implications (bats and newts), damage to habitats (bats in fields).

Out of character with area.

Name: S Milner

Representor No: PRS01004

Representation ID: REP03053 Question Ref: H1

1336, 1330b Tingley - Green to Red

Bats in field

Out of character with area

Drainage is poor, always flooding

Name: Fran Mcknight

Representor No: PRS01009

Representation ID: REP03060 Question Ref: H1

1330b, 1336, 3373a - Green to Red

Extra traffic will cause a danger to children playing .

Drainage in area is already poor.

Endangering wildlife.

Schools becoming overcrowded.

Out of character with area.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1330B

Housing

Haigh Moor Road - Jude's Point, West Ardsley, WF3 1EF

Name: Raymond Germaine

Representor No: PRS01012

Representation ID: REP03065 Question Ref: H1

1330b Tingley - Green to Red (Assumed)
Already too much development in this area leading to road overcrowding and constant road repairs.
Former rural area fast becoming urban congested area.

Name: P P Goodey

Representor No: PRS01014

Representation ID: REP03067 Question Ref: H1

1330b - Green to Purple (Assumed Red)
Alter views,
Overpoulate schools, doctors.
Many animals, bats, etc.

Name: Anne Milner

Representor No: PRS01016

Representation ID: REP03070 Question Ref: H1

1330b, Tingley - Green to Red
Surface water, flooding.
Wildlife, bats, newts. Nature and grassland habitats
Changes to landscape.
Primary and secondary schools are already full and difficult to expand further.

Name: Lynne Watson

Representor No: PRS01020

Representation ID: REP03075 Question Ref: H1

1330b, 1336, 3373a - Green to Red
Current drainage in the area is not sufficient, causing flooding in Westerton Road. Further housing development will exacerbate the problem.
Extra traffic will be created by this development as the current bus services are insufficient .
The proposed site will decimate a natural environment for small mammals, birds and other wildlife.

Name: Judith Blades

Representor No: PRS01026

Representation ID: REP03084 Question Ref: H1

1330B Tingley - Green to Red
Wildlife, bats etc.
Over-population for village.
Surface water - sand bags etc to be used. Drainage poor.
(Reference is made to letter - but no letter attached)

Name: Andrew Davey

Representor No: PRS01030

Representation ID: REP03088 Question Ref: H1

1330b Tingley - Green to Red
Privacy compromised.
Out of character with area.
Traffic access dangerous.
The protection of bats.
Bad surface water/drainage.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1330B

Housing

Haigh Moor Road - Jude's Point, West Ardsley, WF3 1EF

Name: Simon Mcknight

Representor No: PRS01032

Representation ID: REP03091 Question Ref: H1

1330b, 1336, 3373a Green to Red

Damage to fields, bats in the field, poor drainage, danger to local wildlife. Out of character with area.

Name: Jedson Swallow

Representor No: PRS01040

Representation ID: REP03097 Question Ref: H1

1330b Tingley - Green to Red

Badgers, bats, foxes, rabbits, newts and all wildlife.

Flooding / surface water.

It would have a big impact on wildlife.

Name: A Longfellow

Representor No: PRS01060

Representation ID: REP03123 Question Ref: H1

1330B Tingley - Green to Red

Busy Roads

Overcrowded area

Local schools full

Name: M Mccleave

Representor No: PRS01126

Representation ID: REP03201 Question Ref: H1

1330b Tingley - Green to Red

Drainage in the area is not sufficient causing flooding in cellars, driveways and gardens

Out of character with area.

Extra traffic will be created by this development. The proposed site will damage a natural environment for small mammals, birds and other wildlife.

Name: Michael Stilwell

Representor No: PRS01133

Representation ID: REP03207 Question Ref: H1

1330B

Lack of amenities – the amenities in the area cannot support the existing population of West Ardsley, never mind accepting an influx of possibly 5000 more.

- Virtually all the shops have closed over the years, there are now only 3 grocery shops in the area. Anyone living at the southern end of Haigh Moor Road has over 1 mile to travel to the nearest shop.

- The schools are overcrowded, Westerton Road has had more external classrooms added, so it cannot be extended. Hill Top School is nearly full now from the existing population growth, again it is extremely limited in expansion possibilities.

- Bus services are pathetic, services to Leeds, Dewsbury and Wakefield are hourly at best. Batley is only accessible from Wakefield –Batley Road. There are areas where buses have been removed completely. This week another service has been stopped.

- There are not any play areas for children, your own survey records this failing.

- There is only one medical centre with 8 doctors giving cover to some existing 15000 patients. To get an appointment with a specific GP can take 3 weeks, the centre has recently been extended to its limits so there is nowhere to go. Also there is only one pharmacist.

Traffic

All the roads in the area are in a bad state of repair, I have lived here for 28 years and Haigh Moor Road has never been resurfaced despite 3 new housing estates accessing it. In June 1992 the planning inspector denied a planning application (91/23/00350) for an annex for an invalid because although neither he nor his brother drove. The reason for this was "I am concerned that were an additional dwelling to be provided there would be no guarantee that it would not lead to additional traffic generation at some future time, perhaps through changed circumstances, with consequent adverse impact on highway safety." Yet here we are with a further 70 houses at Foxfields and Jude's Pond and a proposed 179 on these new sites, probably adding in excess of 500 vehicles to Haigh Moor Road.

There has been a water leak on HMR which despite being reported to Yorkshire Water is still flowing after 3 months and has now become 2 leaks. The western end of Westerton Road is in a dangerous state with potholes and speed restriction bumps. LCC appears to be unable to keep up with the maintenance of its roads in South Leeds.

LCC's attitude to this area seems to be that Ardsley is an outpost on the borders with Wakefield and Kirklees and beyond the borough or Morley, so we can be conveniently ignored. Ardsley is quite definitely being asked to provide the lion's share of new housing without any benefit, it has poor services and has become a dormitory area of Leeds.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1330B

Housing

Haigh Moor Road - Jude's Point, West Ardsley, WF3 1EF

Name: Des McCleave

Representor No: PRS01160

Representation ID: REP03439 Question Ref: H1

I am writing to veermntly oppose the planning application that is scheduled on Haigh Moor Road, Tingley, Wakefield (plan 1330b map 33). My house will back onto the proposed site. The reason for the the objections stem from the distruction of scenic views across Emley Moor, views which we paid for, to flood risk. These are listed below.

1. Distruction of views.

Three years ago my family and I moved to our home for the secluded atmosphere and scenic views across Wakefield and Emley Moor. During searches, no building or construction plans were found. We have been disturbed by the construction of site 1330a, plans which were not displayed in our area, and we were never informed by mail about these plans. We have opposed plans on this site regarding work planned by Yorkshire Water and have full support from the offices of Ed Balls. We will again be writing to Mr Balls regarding future plans for our area.

2. Flooding Risk.

As my home is at the bottom of a PRIVATE dirt track, backing onto the proposed site, during bad weather we are at risk of flooding. The drainage is insufficient and the water runs down the dirt track and into my drive towards a man hole cover. The dirt from the track is carried by the water and blocks the man hole cover and the water level rises in my drive. I have often been out shovelling water for hours until the rain slows.

Towards the rear of my property on the proposed site, the water runs down from the hill where the houses are to be built and into my garden. Over the past three years we have been flooded on numerous occasions causing extensive damage to my lawn.

The four houses on our track have all reported flood damage in the past.

3. Bats.

We have bats flying in our garden on an evening. These have been reported to the Royal Bats Society. We have been asked to find their home, and we suspect that it is in a large conifer tree at the bottom of my garden next to the proposed site. This is ongoing!!!

4. Drainage.

During heavy rain, the drains in our area overflow, this has been reported to Yorkshire Water. The addition on plan 1330a has increased the risk as it has been joined to our small drainage system / man hole at the bottom of my garden. Increased planned houses planned for 1330b will have to be connected to this drainage, putting increased risk of danger on our system. The pipes run down the access dirt track and across my rear lawn, if the pipes were to burst, my home and garden would be destroyed.

Representation ID: REP03250 Question Ref: H1

1330B Tingley - Green to Red

During bad/wet weather, the drainage from this area is terrible and causes my south facing garden to flood. This has already been pointed out to Yorkshire Water. Extra housing would cause more drainage issues.

Many animals, bats, etc in fields.

New site better suited for dwellings. Houses built in this area will severely alter the view from my house, and impede my privacy.

Name: Annie McNally

Representor No: PRS03059

Representation ID: REP00387 Question Ref: G1

I think it is digusting that the council are wanting to build on greenbelt land on proposed Plots 1336, 3373, 3372, 3373A, 3373B, 3373C, 1330B, 1330A, 536. And 3456A. It is an area of outstanding beauty where people enjoy walking, running, playing and riding horses. Many wild animals live in the fields and to take it away would turn this area into a concrete jungle. It would mean my view at the back would be eradicated, lowering the value of my house, but more importantly the pleasure I have everyday when I look across the field. This city needs green areas where we can walk and get away from the stresses of life. Also, to the rear of my property there is bindweed in the field which I believe would make it difficult for any developers to be able to build on that land. There are plenty of brown field sites which can be developed. Do not take away our green spaces. Totally outrageous.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1330B

Housing

Haigh Moor Road - Jude's Point, West Ardsley, WF3 1EF

Name: Camille Leach

Representor No: PRS03615

Representation ID: REP00848 Question Ref: H1

sites 3373A, 3373B, 3365,1258,site 1330B 464 houses in such a small vicinity is unsustainable, there are currently just over 300 pupils at Hill Top Primary School with no room for any expansion, the school is full and the same is true of Westerton. Leeds City Council have in their allocation plan confirmed that Ardsley and Robin Hood have a deficiency in parks and gardens (the only area in Leeds South West to be deficient)natural greenspace should be used to reduce the deficit and improve our community. Our GP surgeries are at breaking point the surgery at Leigh View was recently extended and it's difficult to envisage how this could be extended further.Further erosion of the demarcation between West Ardsley & Tingley – , the two areas will be barely distinguishable from each other which is contrary to the Councils policy SP1 which clearly states smaller Settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlement's size, function and sustainability. If these plans were approved it will no doubt result in urban sprawl with no identifiable boundaries. Our fields provide a public amenity development would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This view was endorsed by the Secretary of State in their past decision letter.Our road network was not built to support the existing volume of traffic , we do not have the infrastructure to support development of this scale, our public transport links are very poor with only one bus an hour into Leeds, the only viable means of transportation is by car which will have a cumulative impact on the A650 and A653 which are already congested.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1330B

Housing

Haigh Moor Road - Jude's Point, West Ardsley, WF3 1EF

Name: Camille Leach

Representor No: PRS03615

Representation ID: REP00848 Question Ref: General comment

Site 3373C Objections1. Local character and identityDevelopment of this site would be contrary to the following sections of the Council's policy SP1 in the Core Strategy:1. SP1 (i) states: "Smaller Settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlement's size, function and sustainability." Site 3373A, with its estimated capacity of 130 dwellings, does not have regard to the size, function and sustainability of West Ardsley.SP1 (iii) states: "For development to respect and enhance the local character and identity of places and neighbourhoods". The local character and identity of West Ardsley would be seriously threatened by 3373a, 3373C and 1336, and would make its component areas of Upper Green, Haigh Moor and Hill Top barely distinguishable from each other.My view accords with three decision letters from the Planning Inspectorate which were used in the Council's own evidence to the Unitary Development Plan public inquiry in 1995. In paragraph 39 of his report on the Morley Local Plan, the inspector considered that the planned development at Haigh Wood (site WA2H) would have a "very serious impact upon the character and environment of West Ardsley". He concluded in paragraph 10: "In the past, development in the Morley area would appear to have been sporadic and opportunist, placing the identity of the smaller settlements at risk and tending towards the creation of amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the length of the A650 Bradford to Wakefield road. In my view, the further diffusion of the existing loosely-knit settlement pattern should, as far as possible, be resisted."Considering appeals in 1986 on 81/23/00212 and 81/23/00213 (broadly the same area as LDF sites 3373A/B/C and 1336) the inspector said "It would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This was endorsed in the Secretary of State's decision letter.In 1994, a third inspector dismissed an appeal to develop land at Arthington Close near the the edge of Haigh Wood because it would "unacceptably erode the fringe of this rural area and would lead to pressure for further encroachment of residential development, most particularly in the fields to the west..."Although some years have passed since these decisions, the character and environment of the area are still semi-rural and just as delicate. When cogent arguments have been repeatedly made against development of the 3373 areas by the Secretary of State, by three planning inspectors and by Leeds Council itself (in evidence to the UDP inquiry), there can be no justification for sites 3373A, 3373C and 1336 being pursued for residential development in the LDF. They should instead be reclassified as "red" and withdrawn from consideration for development when producing the next stage of the plan.2. Damage to Haigh Wood and Baghill beck valleyDevelopment of this site would be contrary to the Council's policy P12 in the Core Strategy:"The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes, including their historical and cultural significance, will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness through stewardship and the planning process." The secluded Haigh Wood valley comprises the central portion of site 3373A, including part of the wood covered by a Tree Preservation Order. Residential development would prejudice the objectives underlining this policy as set out in paragraphs 5.3.46 to 5.3.48 of the Core Strategy including: "The Council seeks to protect and enhance the varied landscapes of Leeds and the assets they contain, from valued local trees, the countryside to nationally designated landscape, fauna and flora". This view was endorsed by three planning inspectors and again in the Council's evidence, given by Mr G B Andrews, at the UDP inquiry. In his paragraph 4.3.6, Mr Andrews stated: I refer to the conclusions reached by the inspectors at the two subsequent appeal cases in 1985 and 1994. In each case it is acknowledged that the Haigh Wood area is of value as an area of attractive open farmland with a rural character and provides an important amenity in the local area". Even the Council's own assessment for the LDF states that the site is: "Not supported (RED). This site includes Haigh Wood and Baghill Beck Local Nature Area which fall under UK Biological Action Plan priority habitats - a mixture of woodland, scrub and grassland habitats alongside Baghill Beck. There are a number of wide hedgerow/woodland belts throughout the site that provide a valuable habitat. Water vole has been recorded on the Hey Beck. The Baghill Beck flows into this water course and could support this species. Bats to consider."3. FairnessThe Core Strategy seeks to be "fair". The word is used in paragraph 1.2 and again in 1.14. Yet the proposed green housing sites when taken together would definitely not be fair to West Ardsley and Tingley. No justification has been given as to why there is such a concentration here, nor any evidence of local need. Indeed, paragraph 4.6.14 states that "The SHMA 2011 was not able to identify any geographically specific need for new housing based on population growth." The sites seem to have been assessed individually rather than their cumulative impact. This impact is potentially very much greater when considered alongside Kirklees Council's proposals for the Chidswell area. 4. Highway access The Upper Green culs-de-sac and Hill Top Lane cul-de-sacs are not suitable to serve more houses. They would become much less safe for children to play in and the already severe dangers at school times would be exacerbated.5. SchoolsPrimary and secondary schools already full and difficult to expand further.6. Agricultural landGood quality agricultural land would be lost.7. ViabilityExtra costs from: a. parts of 3373A and 3373C have serious levels problems and look undevelopable; b. bell pits known to exist in the area from former mining; c. elimination of Japanese Knotweed.The site on Westerton Road from Regency Gardens to Westerton Wood if developed will see 117 new homes - this land is currently classed as green belt (site 3365 = 83 homes and site 1258 = 34 homes) development here will represent a major incursion into the Green belt and will create further pressure on Ardsley reservoir as a local beauty spot. Development of sites 3365 and 1258 will result in the loss of valuable agricultural land, there are a number of wide hedgerow and woodland belts throughout the site that provide a valuable habitat for wildlife in particular bats. Development of the sites on Westerton Road will result in the amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the whole length of the Westerton Road.Site 1330B is an extension of the building that is currently ongoing adjacent to Jude's pond - and is for a further 32 houses ! This site has major highways access issues and has less than the recommended visibility splay for highways safety - further development of this site will exasperate current problems regarding drainage on the land - Haigh Moor Road residents already have to deal with flooding of the pavements and highways in the vicinity of Jude's pond. 464 houses in such a small vicinity is unsustainable, there are currently just over 300 pupils at Hill Top Primary School with no room for any expansion, the school is full and the same is true of Westerton which as you know was a small village school 20 years ago but is now one of the biggest primary schools in the Leeds district and all because of the amount of building that has taken place over recent years.Leeds City Council have in their allocation plan confirmed that Ardsley and Robin Hood have a deficiency in parks and gardens (the only area in Leeds South West to be deficient) - our children already have very little designated play areas, they have also confirmed that we are deficient in outdoor sports areas and facilities for children to play. We have however got a surplus of natural green space which is currently under threat of housing - if this natural greenspace is to be used for any purpose, surely it should be used to reduce the deficit and improve our community. Further reduction of amenity greenspace in an area which is seeing more and more housing development is unfair and unsustainable.Our GP surgeries are at breaking point with current waiting times for appointments being in excess of two weeks, the surgery at Leigh View was recently extended and it's difficult to envisage how this could be extended further to serve the population boom that will ensue if all these sites are developed.Further erosion of the demarcation between West Ardsley & Tingley - soon the two settlements will merge into one and West Ardsley as a separate community will be subsumed into its near neighbour, the two areas will be barely distinguishable from each other which is contrary to the Councils policy SP1 which clearly states smaller Settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlement's size, function and sustainability. If these plans were approved it will no doubt result in urban sprawl with no identifiable boundaries.Our fields provide a public amenity for dog-walkers, cyclists, ramblers and local residents alike and It would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This view was endorsed by the Secretary of State in their past decision letter.Our road network was not built to support the existing volume of traffic , we do not have the infrastructure to support development of this scale, our public transport links are very poor with only one bus an hour into Leeds, the only viable means of transportation is by car which will have a cumulative impact on the A650 and A653 which are already congested.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1330B

Housing

Haigh Moor Road - Jude's Point, West Ardsley, WF3 1EF

Name: Camille Leach

Representor No: PRS03615

Name: Lynsey Morris

Representor No: PRS05111

Representation ID: REP05692 Question Ref: H1

Hi,

I would like to object against the planning proposals for the following sites on Map 33 (off Westerton Road)

1336
3373B
3373A
1330B
33732
3365
3373C
3456A
3456B
1258

I suggest that these should all be changed to RED due to the following reasons:

Too much traffic already so roads will be extremely busy right outside my front door. I have young children and will be scared for their safety.

Services such as Doctors surgery's, dentists, local hospitals, schools, supermarkets already too busy so won't be able to cope

Less water will be absorbed into the ground resulting in more flooding in our gardens.

This is currently already happening in several houses on Westerton Road including mine.

There are bats, foxes, owls, frogs, newts and many birds living in the area especially on sites 1336, 3373A, 3373B, 3373C. Should these not be protected?

House prices for homeowners in the area already will decrease.

We moved to the area because of the greenery and our view will be spoilt.

The sewerage system in place on Westerton Road recently failed causing waste from the sewers to overflow into nearby houses. This was due to the recent housing developments that have recently been built nearby so the sewerage system was unable to cope. This could very likely happen again.

Name: D, M, S Johnson And Kenny

Representor No: PRS05119

Representation ID: REP05702 Question Ref: General comment

Firstly I would like to express my disappointment and embarrassment towards the councils plans for the proposed plans listed below. I understand the reason behind the lack of communication with the residents in the area may be beneficial to the local council and certain government groups. It obviously cuts down on man hours and paperwork.

I would like to object against the planning proposals for the following sites on Map 33 (off Westerton Road)

1336
3373B
3373A
1330B
33732
3365
3373C
3456A
3456B
1258

The infrastructure in this area will struggle to cope with the demands of the services required.

The area is attracting wildlife not seen in built up areas. It seems a shame to disregard the wildlife issue I'm sure if a full environmental survey of the area was to be carried out this would scupper the planning permission. But again that would be an extra cost to the council which would have an impact at year end when the books are balanced.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1330B

Housing

Haigh Moor Road - Jude's Point, West Ardsley, WF3 1EF

Name: Ian Morris

Representor No: PRS05121

Representation ID: REP05700 Question Ref: H1

Firstly I would like to express my disappointment and embarrassment towards the councils plans for the proposed plans listed below. I understand the reason behind the lack of communication with the residents in the area may be beneficial to the local council and certain government groups. It obviously cuts down on man hours and paperwork.

I would like to object against the planning proposals for the following sites on Map 33 (off Westerton Road)

1336
3373B
3373A
1330B
33732
3365
3373C
3456A
3456B
1258

The infrastructure in this area will struggle to cope with the demands of the services required. The area is attracting wildlife not seen in built up areas. It seems a shame to disregard the wildlife issue I'm sure if a full environmental survey of the area was to be carried out this would scupper the planning permission. But again that would be an extra cost to the council which would have an impact at year end when the books are balanced.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1330B

Housing

Haigh Moor Road - Jude's Point, West Ardsley, WF3 1EF

Name: Stephen Cowling

Representor No: PRS05177

Representation ID: REP05759 Question Ref: H1

I wish to object to 3373A, 3373B & 3373C.

[x]

I wish to object on the following grounds:

. The Haigh Wood site reference is 3373, and it is split into 3 parts:

. 3373A is land between Westerton Road & Haigh Wood. This has been assessed as suitable for residential development, with a capacity of 130 houses.

. 3373B is Haigh Wood itself. This has been assessed as unsuitable for residential development because of the topography of the site and access

. 3373C is the fields between Haigh Wood & Woollin Crescent, linking right round to Nook Farm.

The proposal for site 3373A (This is the site that runs from the top of Baghill around the back of Arthington Close and Upper Green and will finish on Westerton Road opposite Lonsdale Rise) is to build 130 houses. Lee gap Fair is held twice a year in these fields, the fair is the oldest horse fair in England dating back to 1136 and forms part of the history and heritage of the area.

The 3373C site which will run from the top of Hilltop Lane and carve up all the fields from there to Nook Green on Haigh Moor Road is for 144 houses. It can be argued that the highways infrastructure for Site 3373B is inadequate, there are Highways concerns re poor accessibility for the number of houses proposed and then there is the issue of Highways safety with the junction of Hilltop Lane being within 100 metres of the primary school. All the issues on the attached letter are also relevant for site 3373C.

The site on Westerton Road from Regency Gardens to Westerton Wood if developed will see 117 new homes - this land is currently classed as green belt (site 3365 = 83 homes and site 1258 = 34 homes) development here will represent a major incursion into the Green belt and will create further pressure on Ardsley reservoir as a local beauty spot. Development of sites 3365 and 1258 will result in the loss of valuable agricultural land, there are a number of wide hedgerow and woodland belts throughout the site that provide a valuable habitat for wildlife in particular bats. Development of the sites on Westerton Road will result in the amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the whole length of the Westerton Road. Site 1330B is an extension of the building that is currently ongoing adjacent to Jude's pond - and is for a further 32 houses ! This site has major highways access issues and has less than the recommended visibility splay for highways safety - further development of this site will exasperate current problems regarding drainage on the land - Haigh Moor Road residents already have to deal with flooding of the pavements and highways in the vicinity of Jude's pond.

Please note that all these sites are in addition to any planning applications that have already been approved.

464 houses in such a small vicinity is unsustainable, there are currently just over 300 pupils at Hill Top Primary School with no room for any expansion, the school is full and the same is true of Westerton which as you know was a small village school 20 years ago but is now one of the biggest primary schools in the Leeds district and all because of the amount of building that has taken place over recent years.

Leeds City Council have in their allocation plan confirmed that Ardsley and Robin Hood have a deficiency in parks and gardens (the only area in Leeds South West to be deficient) - our children already have very little designated play areas, they have also confirmed that we are deficient in outdoor sports areas and facilities for children to play. We have however got a surplus of natural green space which is currently under threat of housing - if this natural greenspace is to be used for any purpose, surely it should be used to reduce the deficit and improve our community. Further reduction of amenity greenspace in an area which is seeing more and more housing development is unfair and unsustainable.

Our GP surgeries are at breaking point with current waiting times for appointments being in excess of two weeks, the surgery at Leigh View was recently extended and it's difficult to envisage how this could be extended further to serve the population boom that will ensue if all these sites are developed.

Further erosion of the demarcation between West Ardsley & Tingley - soon the two settlements will merge into one and West Ardsley as a separate community will be subsumed into its near neighbour, the two areas will be barely distinguishable from each other which is contrary to the Councils policy SP1 which clearly states smaller Settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlement's size, function and sustainability. If these plans were approved it will no doubt

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1330B

Housing

Haigh Moor Road - Jude's Point, West Ardsley, WF3 1EF

Name: Stephen Cowling

Representor No: PRS05177

result in urban sprawl with no identifiable boundaries.

Our fields provide a public amenity for dog-walkers, cyclists, ramblers and local residents alike and It would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This view was endorsed by the Secretary of State in their past decision letter.

Our road network was not built to support the existing volume of traffic , we do not have the infrastructure to support development of this scale, our public transport links are very poor with only one bus an hour into Leeds, the only viable means of transportation is by car which will have a cumulative impact on the A650 and A653 which are already congested I trust that this is in order.

Regards

[x]

Name: Lisa Mulherin

Representor No: PRS05734

Representation ID: REP07126 Question Ref: H1

1330B Jude's Pond, West Ardsley – The consultation document does not make clear the current status of this site. Recent experience of the "development" of the adjoining site does not inspire confidence in the developer's approach to working with the local community. If done with due care and attention to the local environment and with respect for the local community this would be a relatively sustainable addition.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1330B

Housing

Haigh Moor Road - Jude's Point, West Ardsley, WF3 1EF

Name: West Ardsley Consortium

Representor No: PRS06168

Representation ID: REP07292 Question Ref: H7

Dear Madam

Allocations Issues and Options Document - Sites 536 (Nook Farm) , 1330 B (Adjacent to Judes Pond), 1336 (Westerton Road, and 3373 A, B and C (Haigh Wood)

We act on behalf of the West Ardsley Consortium that has made formal comments to the Leeds Site Allocations Issues and Options documents. We enclose a copy of the Document submitted with the formal response for your information.

Our clients are interested in sites 536 (Nook Farm) , 1330 B (Adjacent to Judes Pond), 1336 (Westerton Road, and 3373 A, B and C (Haigh Wood) and have previously made representations for the sites to be allocated, along with a substantial area of ecologically maintained open space centred around the Haigh Wood area.

Having seen the draft proposals our clients are supportive in principle of the Councils approach to identifying a large portion of the land promoted by them for residential development. The areas identified as "Green" (for development) in the Issues and Options document at Haigh Wood amount to 16.83 Ha of land with a suggested dwelling capacity of over 400 units (at a reasonably low 25/Ha). The areas identified as "Red" (felt to be not suitable for development) amount to 17.5 Ha. This sets an approach of slightly over half the land being protected from development.

We note that the site known as Nook Farm (536) is an existing UDPR commitment and has no policy designation that has or would suggest anything other than its suitability for residential development. That site also has (contrary to the suggestion in the Issues and Options document) an extant planning permission. The details of this are set out in our formal representations.

Having reviewed the indicative boundaries suggested between the "Green" and "Red" sites in the Issues and Options document and undertaken a detailed assessment against trees, topography, the LNA of Haigh Wood and the stream running through it, whilst acknowledging the need for an uninterrupted green corridor separating the north west and south east areas of land, our clients are firmly of the view that the Councils preliminary work does not produce appropriate boundaries between development allocations and non development allocations. For example as figure 3 in the attached document shows land is identified by the Council for development in site 3373A that includes part of the LNA, the trees of Haigh Wood and the stream running through it, whilst seeking to protect from development land to the south east which has none of those considerations applying to it.

Utilising the work already done on ecology, trees and hedges, landscape and topography, our Clients have carefully considered the Councils objectives and aspirations from the comments in the tables and pro formas associated with the Issues and Options document. They have produced a revised masterplan and from that been able to identify appropriate development and allocation boundaries. These maintain a broad green corridor through the valley, protecting ecological interests, trees and the stream as well as views and the "open feel" of the valley itself. In particular this has not only widened the broad swathe of green between the development areas, compared to the earlier 2012 masterplan, but removed any road connections across the valley.

The resultant masterplan has been informed by all the Consortium team's professional disciplines and the changed highways connections fully evaluated to ensure they work appropriately.

The outcome is that of the area in the UDPR that is identified as NI 1 (some 36.14 Ha) only 40% is now proposed for development. The suggested allocations (boundaries shown in red on Figure 6 of the attached document include (so that the allocations are not excessively subdivided) substantial green corridors and strategic planting, amounting to some 3.24Ha. These run along the existing and proposed pedestrian and bridleway access corridors to the valley and the Wood. The suggested total area of the allocations (including the 3.24 Ha of undeveloped green space) is under half of the current NI1 land at 17.66 Ha. We believe this provides the right balance of development and protection of the wider site.

We note that the areas identified as "Green" in the Issues and Options document in this Outer South West area are insufficient by some margin (1,432) to meet the Core Strategy suggested proportion of housing for the area, even taking into account (and not questioning) the amount of development to come forward from permissions and existing allocations. There should be no doubt that all "Green" sites should therefore go forward for allocation. Indeed more will need to be found from "Amber" or even "Red" sites to provide sufficient land. In addition, there are proportionately far fewer "Green" sites (compared to "Amber") in East and West Ardsley than there are in Morley or the rest of the Outer South West.

The site at Haigh Wood with its non greenbelt status and accessibility and sustainability credentials provides a very good location for development and the provision of material environmental benefits through protection, increased access and environmental management of the Wood itself. As there have to be exceptional circumstances to take land out of the greenbelt, there must correspondingly be exceptional circumstances not to develop at Haigh Wood ahead of greenbelt land.

For all of these reasons our clients, look forward to working with the Council to bring forward development in line with the attached revised masterplan, which we believe fully addresses all comments made in the Issues and Options document and the related proformas about the land at Haigh Wood.

Yours faithfully

[x]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1330B

Housing

Haigh Moor Road - Jude's Point, West Ardsley, WF3 1EF

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 1 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if these sites would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. Significant developer contributions will be required at these sites to improve the public transport to meet the council LDF accessibility policies; particularly in the larger sites should these be brought forward for development. These include SHLAA ref: 2062, 1032, 1046, 1017 & 1055.

Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small sites low capacity are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

The table also includes accessibility assessments results to access other services and facilities within acceptable journey times on public transport.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H1

Disagree with Council's green assessment, think the site should be red

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H1

Disagree with Council's green assessment, think the site should be red

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1332

Housing

Adwalton - Penfields, Drighlington

Name: Brian Guy

Representor No: PRS00142

Representation ID: REP04659 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Name: A Hampshire

Representor No: PRS00149

Representation ID: REP00923 Question Ref: H4

1332 - Red. Far too valuable as Green Belt to be covered by 414 houses. Detrimental to the village. Too much traffic. School already too small - loss of green space. Very strong objection to 414 houses on this site.

Name: Wenda P Whitehead

Representor No: PRS00312

Representation ID: REP04786 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Name: L. A Mitchell

Representor No: PRS00327

Representation ID: REP02264 Question Ref: H4

2124 All sites in Drighlington should be red sites. Should be green belt, how can Wakefield Road cope with with any more traffic, the roads are already coping with very heavy traffic where would access be. The new by pass is already full of traffic again the village does not have infrastructure for any more people, transport or houses. The schools are full. We had two schools, one has now closed, already the new school has had an extension - so where will all the children go? Why not refurbish the disused mill on Whitehall Road for housing instead of using green field sites?

Name: Doreen Goor

Representor No: PRS00329

Representation ID: REP02274 Question Ref: H4

Amber to red. 2124/1332 - Car access not suitable

Name: P And K. H Copley

Representor No: PRS00331

Representation ID: REP02276 Question Ref: H4

Amber to red. 2124, 1332. Entrance and exits dangerous and not enough room.

Name: J Glazzard

Representor No: PRS00332

Representation ID: REP02277 Question Ref: H4

2124, 1332. Drighlington cannot take any more property/schools/doctors/sewage/shops. Roads overcrowded.

Name: Janice Beever

Representor No: PRS00441

Representation ID: REP04791 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1332

Housing

Adwalton - Penfields, Drighlington

Name: Jennifer Adams

Representor No: PRS00456

Representation ID: REP02404 Question Ref: H3

1332 – This would be my preferable site for this area as it has a natural defendable boundary with the A650, and would round off the parish without encroaching on green belt.

Name: Elaine Thorton

Representor No: PRS00584

Representation ID: REP02542 Question Ref: H4

1332- Land at Penfield Drighlington. Amber to Red this site for 414 homes would place if completed an intolerable burden on local infrastructure. The local roads are not capable of handling the numbers of vehicles movements to and from the site. If a separate entrance / exit were constructed on the A650 Drighlington bypass this in turn would overburden a very busy junction 27 of the M62 / M621 and associated arterial roads.

Name: Susan Wood

Representor No: PRS00739

Representation ID: REP02742 Question Ref: H4

1332 – This site would finish the development that already exists up to a defensible boundary. Allowing good access to the motorway network. There are excellent local amenities.

Name: P S Barrie

Representor No: PRS00915

Representation ID: REP04810 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Representation ID: REP04769 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Representation ID: REP04781 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Name: Lynne Paul

Representor No: PRS01169

Representation ID: REP04800 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Name: D Paul

Representor No: PRS01183

Representation ID: REP04793 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1332

Housing

Adwalton - Penfields, Drighlington

Name: Geraldine Hoare

Representor No: PRS01300

Representation ID: REP03409 Question Ref: H3

1332 - Yes - should be green.
Good defendable boundary.
Rounding off settlement.
Good access to motorways - able to travel to Bradford / Halifax / Leeds / Wakefield.
Good local amenity - shops / doctors / leisure.

Name: Pamela Adams

Representor No: PRS01318

Representation ID: REP03428 Question Ref: H3

1332 – This site would be a more appropriate development which would have a natural defendable boundary with good access and would not join two parishes and would round off the Drighlington Parish without encroaching on green belt.

Name: L And C Wekhell And Wetton

Representor No: PRS01435

Representation ID: REP03565 Question Ref: H4

1332 – amber to red. Close proximity to J27. They are now using hard shoulder because of daily traffic congestion. Why use green belt site when there are plenty of brownfield sites and vacant housing. Only one school in Drighlington.

Name: B Stringer

Representor No: PRS01606

Representation ID: REP04797 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North
Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Name: L.e Beever

Representor No: PRS01607

Representation ID: REP04804 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North
Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Name: J Cowie

Representor No: PRS02227

Representation ID: REP04768 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North
Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Name: Susan Holt

Representor No: PRS02289

Representation ID: REP04772 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North
Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1332

Housing

Adwalton - Penfields, Drighlington

Name: Dereck Holt

Representor No: PRS02311

Representation ID: REP04766 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Name: Jenni Davenport

Representor No: PRS02330

Representation ID: REP04770 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Name: Frank Raven

Representor No: PRS02339

Representation ID: REP04771 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Name: E Naylor

Representor No: PRS02363

Representation ID: REP04780 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Name: Kathleen Paver

Representor No: PRS02372

Representation ID: REP04774 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Name: C Guy

Representor No: PRS02377

Representation ID: REP04767 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Name: C Clegg

Representor No: PRS02406

Representation ID: REP04663 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1332

Housing

Adwalton - Penfields, Drighlington

Name: Doreen Gill

Representor No: PRS02496

Representation ID: REP04755 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Name: D Naylor

Representor No: PRS02497

Representation ID: REP04773 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Name: A Paver

Representor No: PRS02498

Representation ID: REP04775 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Name: James Bowers

Representor No: PRS02500

Representation ID: REP04777 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Name: Alan Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02501

Representation ID: REP04778 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Name: Vivienne Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02502

Representation ID: REP04779 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Name: Vivian Oxtoby

Representor No: PRS02504

Representation ID: REP04783 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1332

Housing

Adwalton - Penfields, Drighlington

Name: Beryl Hewitt

Representor No: PRS02506

Representation ID: REP04785 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Name: D A Clegg

Representor No: PRS02507

Representation ID: REP04788 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Name: Pauline Wood

Representor No: PRS02508

Representation ID: REP04790 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Name: Joyce Thompson

Representor No: PRS02510

Representation ID: REP04792 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Name: Patricia Aston

Representor No: PRS02513

Representation ID: REP04796 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Name: L. G Wilson

Representor No: PRS02515

Representation ID: REP04799 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Name: S Laurence

Representor No: PRS02517

Representation ID: REP04801 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1332

Housing

Adwalton - Penfields, Drighlington

Name: C Graham

Representor No: PRS02518

Representation ID: REP04803 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Name: M Allsop

Representor No: PRS02520

Representation ID: REP04805 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Name: R Hartill

Representor No: PRS02521

Representation ID: REP04806 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Name: Edith Holmes

Representor No: PRS02522

Representation ID: REP04808 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Name: Harry Holmes

Representor No: PRS02524

Representation ID: REP04811 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Name: Ann Morse

Representor No: PRS02526

Representation ID: REP04813 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Name: L.r Morse

Representor No: PRS02527

Representation ID: REP04816 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1332

Housing

Adwalton - Penfields, Drighlington

Name: Michael Hartill

Representor No: PRS02556

Representation ID: REP04847 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Name: Jim Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02561

Representation ID: REP04852 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Name: Helen Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02562

Representation ID: REP04855 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Name: Ronald Gill

Representor No: PRS02564

Representation ID: REP04858 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Name: A.w Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02565

Representation ID: REP04859 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Name: J Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02566

Representation ID: REP04860 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Name: Norman Dearden

Representor No: PRS02568

Representation ID: REP04857 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields, Drighlington, Site Capacity 414, Ward Morley North

Development would round off the settlement and has a defensible boundary to the south. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to busy main roads apply to this site.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1332

Housing

Adwalton - Penfields, Drighlington

Name: Russell Doherty

Representor No: PRS02666

Representation ID: REP05118 Question Ref: H4

1332 Penfields

This site would be ideal to delivery in the short term:- round off the existing housing. Good, defendable boundary wall with A650 bypass – no sprawl. Good access to local shops, eg both in Drighlington and junction 27 outlet for jobs and leisure. Also good road links to Leeds, Bradford, Wakefield, Halifax.

Name: David Blockley

Representor No: PRS02668

Representation ID: REP05119 Question Ref: H4

1332

Short term development is viable of this site.

Representation ID: REP05119 Question Ref: H4

1332

Three good vehicular access points possible for this site which will take traffic away from Drighlington. A natural progression of the existing housing development.

Name: Angela Blockley

Representor No: PRS02674

Representation ID: REP05125 Question Ref: H4

1332

This site has definable boundaries with the A650 Drighlington bypass. Housing of two sides so natural progression of development. Three possible entry access points. Taking traffic out of the village to all major motorway links and major towns. No congestion through Drighlington village.

Representation ID: REP05125 Question Ref: H4

1332

Delivery and development of this site is achievable in the short term within 5 years.

Name: Claire Woodhead

Representor No: PRS02678

Representation ID: REP05129 Question Ref: H4

1332

I agree this site identified represents potential for future development. It has a defendable boundary. It has good drainage. The existing estate offers access into the site. Confined area not imposing on the open countryside.

Name: Arthur Thornton

Representor No: PRS02730

Representation ID: REP05188 Question Ref: H4

Land at Penfield Drighlington. Amber to Red, this site for 414 homes would place if completed an intolerable burden on local infrastructure. The local roads are not capable of handling the numbers of vehicles movements to and from the site. If a separate entrance / exit were constructed on the A650 Drighlington bypass this in turn would overburden a very busy junction 27 of the M52 / M621 and associated arterial roads.

Name: Gemma Wood

Representor No: PRS05077

Representation ID: REP05644 Question Ref: H4

Yes 1332 should have been green as has the A650 as a defendable boundary and the site would round off the original settlement of Drighlington, close to jobs etc at junction 27 outlet. Good access via Walton Drive and Fieldhead Lane

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1332

Housing

Adwalton - Penfields, Drighlington

Name: Alan Hoare

Representor No: PRS05284

Representation ID: REP05878 Question Ref: H4

1332 Adwalton - Penfields. Amber to Green.

Name: Abigail Doherty

Representor No: PRS05323

Representation ID: REP05914 Question Ref: H4

1332 Adwalton - Penfields

Name: Samuel Wood

Representor No: PRS05348

Representation ID: REP05934 Question Ref: H4

3064 Greystone farm/bungalow, Wakefield Road. Amber to Red.

No we think it should be Red as it joins Gildersome and Drighlington and has no defendable boundary.

Representation ID: REP05934 Question Ref: H4

1332 Adwalton - Penfields. Amber to Green.

Yes this site should be Green as it has good access via Walton Drive and fieldhead lane. Drainage is good as it would not cause further overuse of Drighlinton's sewers as it could go to Birstal and down Geldard Road.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1332

Housing

Adwalton - Penfields, Drighlington

Name: Hoare

Representor No: PRS05410

Representation ID: REP06016 Question Ref: H1

Site 1332

As noted in the introductory chapters, this report is to promote the merits of site 1332, a 18.4 hectare site located to the south of Drighlington. The site has been assessed by the council and classified in the 'amber' category of sites. Judging from the limited justification provided, this is due to alleged highways concerns regarding poor accessibility, limited access provision and the sites current designation as Green Belt.

4.4 Further work has been undertaken by a highways consultant, urban designers and planners in order to overcome these concerns. Taking each point in turn:

Accessibility and access provision

4.4 A highways consultant has been appointed to carry out a feasibility study into possible access routes. The findings are detailed in a standalone report but the conclusions have influenced the indicative master plan contained in the promotion document.

4.5 The Walton Drive access to the site will be retained in its current position and used as the main access to the site for vehicles, particularly for the first phase of development (circa 250 dwellings). A second vehicular is available to the site (accessing the farm at the western end of the site) however for the purposes of this study, vehicular access to the site will only be considered via Walton Drive.

4.6 It is proposed to extend the carriageway and footways of Walton Drive into the site whilst maintaining the existing 5.5m wide carriageway and 2m wide footway provisions to both sides of the carriageway. Within the site, it is proposed to widen the footways to 3m (on both sides of the carriageway) to provide off -road pedestrian-cycle infrastructure. This is in accordance with Leeds City Council's Street Design Guide.

4.7 The access route from the site to Wakefield Road is via Walton Drive, Margetson Road and Oakwell Road. These routes are between 5.5m and 7.3m wide with footways to both sides of the carriageway, street lighting and built to appropriate standards.

4.8 There is the possibility that some traffic may choose to use Fairfax Avenue as part of the route to Wakefield Road/King Street however given the relatively narrower roads and approach to its junction with Wakefield Road, and the restricted visibility out of the junction, it is likely that drivers would prefer the use of Oakwell Road.

4.9 Assigning the full quantum of development generated traffic via the Oakwell Road/Wakefield Road junction considers the worst case approach and should drivers choose to use alternative routes, this is likely to minimise the impact at the Oakwell Road/Wakefield Road junction.

Assessment of current Green Belt role

4.10 The submission draft of the Core Strategy acknowledges that land sufficient to provide, as a minimum, 66,000 new homes over the plan period. In order to fulfil this commitment, it accepts that in addition to focusing development to the most sustainable areas of the district, appropriate sites will have to be allocated that may currently be designated as Green Belt. An approach consistent with the Framework. While the need for sites currently designated as Green Belt to be brought forward is accepted, preference should be given to those sites that no longer fulfil any of the five purposes for its original inclusion.

4.11 In order to establish to what degree each of the sites put forward contribute to fulfilling a Green Belt purpose, the council have carried out a very basic Green Belt assessment. Four of the purposes for including land with the Green Belt are listed in the assessment section of the proforma. It is important to note that the fifth reason has been omitted. The Core Strategy policies will aim to encourage regeneration within the urban area. While it is a priority to bring forward urban regeneration sites in preference to Greenfield sites, this is only possible where such sites can provide enough deliverable sites to meet the identified requirements. By the stance taken in the Core Strategy, this is clearly not the case in Leeds for the plan period. So for the purposes of assessing a sites suitability in terms the level of conflict with the purposes of being in the Green Belt, only the remaining four will be applied.

1. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

4.12 The conclusions of the council's assessment on this purpose are positive. We agree that the site is well connected to the built up area and development of the site would effectively round off the settlement pattern. Those two factors mean that there is a 'low potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl'.

2. Prevent neighbouring towns from merging

4.13 The site is located on the southern edge of Drighlington. The nearest adjacent settlement is Bristall, 0.5 miles to the south. The two are separated however by the A650 bypass and the M62 motorway which acts as a natural barrier preventing the sprawl of the settlement further to the south.

4.14 Again the councils overall conclusions on coalescence that there will be 'no merging of settlements' is positive and welcomed.

3. Assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachment

4.15 When assessing the sites role in relation to the above, the council have concluded that the sites does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Again this stance is welcomed but there are a few obvious points which need clarification.

4.16 The site is currently in private use and is actively used in connection with a small holding business. The site is bound on all four sides by either a post and rail fence, mature

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1332

Housing

Adwalton - Penfields, Drighlington

Name: Hoare

Representor No: PRS05410

hedgerows, or a steep embankment overlooking the bypass. Access into the site is therefore limited to two locations, off Walton Drive to the north and field head lane to the west. Both these access points are private and adequately secured to prevent unauthorised access. There is however a clearly defined footpath which runs from Walton Drive, through the middle of the site, across the bypass, the M62 motorway and into the Birstall retail park to the south. This fulfils an important role in improving accessibility for existing residents living in Adwalton. As demonstrated in the indicative master plan within the promotional document, this would be improved and incorporated around the residential development.

4. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

4.17 The Site is not located within or adjacent to a conversation area, listed building or other historical feature. This criterion is not considered applicable in this instance.

Representation ID: REP06016 Question Ref: H11

Site 1332

It is anticipated that once adopted the emerging development plan will be in place for the next 15 years. Our client therefore accepts that phasing of the sites across the Outer South West area will need to take place.

4.45 The site is largely vacant and is being actively promoted by the current land owners so its immediate availability should not be a concern. Should the site be allocated for residential development it could be brought forward almost immediately.

4.46 Given the size of the site, construction will need to be carried out on a phased basis. Alongside the preparation of the indicative master plan, further work has been carried out to demonstrate how the site could be developed on a phased basis.

See also representation submitted for full details.

Name: Neil Dawson

Representor No: PRS05884

Representation ID: REP06563 Question Ref: H4

Suggested sites from Amber to Red;

309
1067B
1069
1143F
1220A
1274
1275A
1279
1332
2105
2155
3000
3064
3078A
4004

These sites are almost all located within the existing Green Belt and expansion into the Green Belt would lead to increased urban sprawl between the various townships in the Outer South West, and lead to coalescence between communities

Development of the Green Belt sites would also reduce the open green area and provide encroachment into the countryside around Morley and other smaller townships.

In addition there is insufficient road capacity and little scope for expansion for other necessary services. There would be a requirement for new or upgrading of existing roads which would therefore favour development on sites that are already located within the Morley or the Leeds Urban areas rather than eroding the Green Belt further.

Site 3078A is close to potential development in Kirklees and could lead to the complete erosion of the Green Belt and open green space between Leeds and Kirklees.

Any further development at sites 1275A and 1279 would reduce the Green Belt between the existing residential boundary and the A653 Dewsbury Road to a narrow strip which would put pressure in future years to extend residential use further east.

See rep for full details.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1332

Housing

Adwalton - Penfields, Drighlington

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H4

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Amber Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are be minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H4

Disagree with Council's amber assessment, think the site should be red

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H4

Disagree with Council's amber assessment, think the site should be red

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1334

Housing

Pitty Close Farm, Drighlington BD11

Name: L. A Mitchell

Representor No: PRS00327

Representation ID: REP02264 Question Ref: H7

1334, 1266. All sites in Drighlington should be red sites. We had two schools, one has now closed, already the new school has had an extension - so where will all the children go? Why not refurbish the disused mill on Whitehall Road for housing instead of using green field sites?

Name: Doreen Goor

Representor No: PRS00329

Representation ID: REP02274 Question Ref: H7

Stay at red 1266/1334

Name: M. J Cousin

Representor No: PRS00330

Representation ID: REP02275 Question Ref: H7

1266, 1334 - The schools are full as are the dentists and health. Not enough shops, services or sewerage systems.

Name: P And K. H Copley

Representor No: PRS00331

Representation ID: REP02276 Question Ref: H7

1266/1334 - All sites in Drighlington red.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1336

Housing

Westerton Road (land at), West Ardsley

Name: J Vaughan

Representor No: PRS00152

Representation ID: REP01822 Question Ref: H1

1336 - Green to red. There is already a large amount of new building in the area and already congested (and exceedingly badly maintained) roads, schools and other services cannot cope. As there seem to be hundreds of empty flats in the city centre, I question the necessity of so much more new housing!

Name: Sally Buttler

Representor No: PRS00162

Representation ID: REP01834 Question Ref: H1

1336 - Should be changed Green to Red. Site is agricultural with no access, there is a world shortage of agricultural fields, it will ruin wildlife, peoples quality of life, character of the area. Children's safety will be impaired and is currently a safe cul de sac.

Name: Katie Kerr

Representor No: PRS00163

Representation ID: REP01836 Question Ref: H1

1336 - Already traffic/parking issues at peak times/school times. Increased housing means increased population increased traffic issues, school places? Reducing effectiveness of services available to public eg doctors.

Name: John Hill

Representor No: PRS00171

Representation ID: REP02097 Question Ref: H1

1336 - Green to red. The area will be too congested. Westerton Road will be too congested.

Name: Jill Butler

Representor No: PRS00189

Representation ID: REP06966 Question Ref: H1

3373a
[and assume 1336]
I wish to strongly object to proposed green belt sites adjacent and behind my house being released as suitable for building. The proposed sites are shown on Map 33 - 3373a. My house was only built 3 years ago and was bought specifically for the semi rural aspect views and the fact it is safe for children in a cul-de-sac with no thru traffic. I am extremely appalled and concerned that this proposal has been addressed without informing us at all. This will result in us having to move home that we have invested every penny in and worked so hard for and a loss in value of at least £50-75k. And will now make it very difficult to sell. I am absolutely disgusted and will do everything in my power to stop this happening. I will also be attending the town hall meeting and will be involving all local MPs.

Representation ID: REP02128 Question Ref: H1

1336 - Green to red.

Existing agricultural land, access problems, schools full, parking etc. No access to be made from Upper Green Drive will cause child safety issues.

Representation ID: REP02645 Question Ref: H1

1336 +3337/3A Westerton Road/Haigh Woods. Red

This is greenbelt that is adjacent and back of my house directly. My house was built and bought only 2 years ago for the view and cul-de-sac position for my child we paid an additional £60K for this privacy. This site will ruin my property and our lives and cause safety issue with through traffic end of Uppergreen Drive and rear.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1336

Housing

Westerton Road (land at), West Ardsley

Name: Richard Butler

Representor No: PRS00191

Representation ID: REP02129 Question Ref: H1

1336 - Green to red.

Schools, doctors are full, this land is existing agricultural land which apparently we are short of!

Representation ID: REP02862 Question Ref: H1

3373A and 1336. Tingley, Green to Red.

Greenbelt and loss of views etc. De value of property, safety issues with regards to children playing and cureently a cul de sac.

Syke Road Post Office to the r.sh derelick houses and site needs developing. GREEN.

Name: S Jassi

Representor No: PRS00227

Representation ID: REP02157 Question Ref: H1

1336 - Green to red. In Green Belt. This will cause much more traffic if the access is through Upper Green Drive and we moved here because it is a cul de sac currently.

Name: Sheree Haley

Representor No: PRS00241

Representation ID: REP02173 Question Ref: H1

1336 - Additional housing will result in additional cars on the roads which are already congested. Doctor's, dentists and schools already full - waiting times for appointment are likely to increase, which is not acceptable. Surely a brown field site could be used.

Name: M Haley

Representor No: PRS00243

Representation ID: REP02177 Question Ref: H1

1336 - As above [3373A], additional housing will result in an increase in traffic, roads are already congested. Doctors, dentists and local schools cannot cope with an increase in population, waiting times are long to see a doctor and schools are full.

Name: Hayley Hey

Representor No: PRS00244

Representation ID: REP02178 Question Ref: H1

1336 - Green to red. Already traffic/parking issues at peak times/school times. Issues same as mentioned above [3373A] with restrictions to quality of services available with increased population.

Name: Terence Butler

Representor No: PRS00245

Representation ID: REP02179 Question Ref: H1

1336 - Green to red. Rural wildlife, quality of life. Currently a safe culdesac for children to play (Upper Green Drive).

Name: Jennie Wormald

Representor No: PRS00541

Representation ID: REP02491 Question Ref: H1

1336 -
Again the concern is more traffic on an already busy road. Where are all the new children going to go to school, the academy is always oversubscribed as it takes in children not from Garforth but from other trust primary schools. What about all the doctors and dentists, you already have to wait a week for an appointment.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1336

Housing

Westerton Road (land at), West Ardsley

Name: Julie Smith

Representor No: PRS00583

Representation ID: REP02541 Question Ref: H1

1336 / 1100 / 1044 –

I strongly oppose any further new developments in the Garforth area without additional public services for the schools, doctors and dentists to cope with and these is already insufficient parks and sports facilities. I understand there are proposals to close the local fire station when demand for this and police is already high. There will also be a negative impact on wildlife and unacceptable loss of further green belt land.

Name: M Fleming

Representor No: PRS00680

Representation ID: REP02673 Question Ref: H1

1336 - Green to Red.

Name: E Dodds

Representor No: PRS00685

Representation ID: REP02680 Question Ref: H1

1336- Green to red

Name: Alan Osborne

Representor No: PRS00751

Representation ID: REP02754 Question Ref: H1

1336 Land at Westerton Road, West Ardsley: Green to red. As above. Concerns around school capacities

Name: Judith Osborne

Representor No: PRS00756

Representation ID: REP02761 Question Ref: H1

1336 As Above 3373A and building on green space, which adds to a feeling of spaciousness in this area

Name: M Gore

Representor No: PRS00765

Representation ID: REP02778 Question Ref: H1

1336 – Selby Road in between the Old George and the Goose Public Houses. This area is not suitable owing to the wildlife.

Name: Herbie Jassi

Representor No: PRS00847

Representation ID: REP02863 Question Ref: H1

1336 (Near Upper Green Drive). Green to Red.

In the Greenbelt. Too much traffic through Upper Green Drive which will result in an increased of cars.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1336

Housing

Westerton Road (land at), West Ardsley

Name: A Godfrey

Representor No: PRS00852

Representation ID: REP02869 Question Ref: H1

3373A / 1336 -
Green to Red

Congestion

It now seems the norm that each house equates to two vehicles so the proposal of 205 houses means 410 additional cars.

We already experience severe traffic congestion at peak school times. From my observation the vast majority of parents bring their children to school in a car despite the fact that they live in the immediate locality.

The problems that this congestion brings, are dangerous and illegal parking with complete disregard to the safety of pedestrians and other road users. Cars are parked on corners at road junctions, on the pavement where passing with a pram is often impossible and parking already stretches down both Upper Green Way and Avenue. When challenged the drivers often become abusive. The police are aware of this situation and do appear to monitor it from time to time.

Schools

Can the local schools cope with all the additional pupils? Westerton School, Woodkirk School and Blackgates School have already been extended. Increased classroom sizes would have a detrimental effect on the teaching and learning of the children.

Lee Fair

Lee Fair has existed in this locality for hundreds of years and the locals are proud of its historical legacy. Would the Fair disappear completely or be moved away from the area. It would be very disappointing if this happened.

Name: P Godfrey

Representor No: PRS00854

Representation ID: REP02870 Question Ref: H1

3373A / 1336 -
Green to Red

Congestion

It now seems the norm that each house equates to two vehicles so the proposal of 205 houses means 410 additional cars.

We already experience severe traffic congestion at peak school times. From my observation the vast majority of parents bring their children to school in a car despite the fact that they live in the immediate locality.

The problems that this congestion brings, are dangerous and illegal parking with complete disregard to the safety of pedestrians and other road users. Cars are parked on corners at road junctions, on the pavement where passing with a pram is often impossible and parking already stretches down both Upper Green Way and Avenue. When challenged the drivers often become abusive. The police are aware of this situation and do appear to monitor it from time to time.

Schools

Can the local schools cope with all the additional pupils? Westerton School, Woodkirk School and Blackgates School have already been extended. Increased classroom sizes would have a detrimental effect on the teaching and learning of the children.

Lee Fair

Lee Fair has existed in this locality for hundreds of years and the locals are proud of its historical legacy. Would the Fair disappear completely or be moved away from the area. It would be very disappointing if this happened.

Name: Suzy Khalik

Representor No: PRS00892

Representation ID: REP02914 Question Ref: H1

1336 Westerton Road - Green to Red (Assumed)
Too much traffic

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1336

Housing

Westerton Road (land at), West Ardsley

Name: A Haley

Representor No: PRS00893

Representation ID: REP02915 Question Ref: H1

1336 Westerton Road - Green to Red (Assumed)
Additional road congestion, insufficient schools and doctors in this area already.
Need to keep some countryside for future generations.

Name: M Wadsworth

Representor No: PRS00895

Representation ID: REP02920 Question Ref: H1

1336 - Tingley Green to Red.

Name: Sukhvinder Bhadal

Representor No: PRS00899

Representation ID: REP02923 Question Ref: H1

1336 Westerton Road - Green to Red (Assumed)
Incredibly busy location with primary school and pub nearby - too much congestion.

Name: Cynthia Samuel

Representor No: PRS00901

Representation ID: REP02926 Question Ref: H1

1336 Westerton Road - Green to Red
Green Belt, inappropriate allocation

Name: Lilian Stoner

Representor No: PRS00905

Representation ID: REP02930 Question Ref: H1

1336 Westerton Road - Green to Red (Assumed)
Only bit of Green Belt left
Plenty of new building already going up in this area and still unsold

Name: Michael White

Representor No: PRS00906

Representation ID: REP02932 Question Ref: H1

1336 Westerton Road - Green to Red (Assumed)
Traffic, doctors schools.

Name: Angela Binns

Representor No: PRS00908

Representation ID: REP02935 Question Ref: H1

1336 Westerton Road - Green to Red (Assumed)
Too built up, let's leave a bit of countryside

Name: John Khalik

Representor No: PRS00909

Representation ID: REP02936 Question Ref: H1

1336 Westerton Road - Green to Red (Assumed)
Road congestion, lack of schools, doctors and dentists.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1336

Housing

Westerton Road (land at), West Ardsley

Name: R White

Representor No: PRS00910

Representation ID: REP02937 Question Ref: H1

1336 Westerton Road - Green to Red (Assumed)
Congestion, lack of doctors, dentists, schools in this area already

Name: Anne Smith

Representor No: PRS00911

Representation ID: REP02938 Question Ref: H1

1336 Westerton Road - Green to Red (Assumed)
Green Belt
Will lead to too much traffic, schools in the area are already over subscribed

Representation ID: REP04561 Question Ref: H1

site number 1336 Land at Westerton Road, West Ardsley. Change from Green to Red. Retain agricultural land in Green Belt.

Name: Maureen Jenkinson

Representor No: PRS00912

Representation ID: REP02939 Question Ref: H1

1336 - Westerton Road - Green to Red (Assumed)
We need to keep our Green Belt!
Too overcrowded, ag, roads, schools, doctors

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1336

Housing

Westerton Road (land at), West Ardsley

Name: Jake Weatherhead

Representor No: PRS00948

Representation ID: REP02976 Question Ref: H1

3373a Upper Green, Tingley/3373c Upper Green Tingley/1336 Upper Green Tingley - Green to Red
SITE ALLOCATION CHANGES —SITE NUMBERS 3373A / 3373C / 1336

We are completely against the development of the above sites for a number of reasons, both personal and in the overall interest of the people living within Greater Morley.

- Access —Suggested access to the new sites through current 'Upper Green' roads would not be viable as road width/layout does not comply with planning requirements for a throughroad.

At present certain areas of the roads cannot accommodate two cars at the same time, more houses mean more traffic. This could lead to huge health and safety issues for motorists and pedestrians alike. Currently traffic on these roads are already at a high especially at peak times and the start and end of the school day (Westerton Primary is directly opposite upper green and is extremely busy at drop off and pick up times).

- Local framework —The local schools (both primary and secondary) are already full and have waiting lists for children already living in the area. Primary schools such as Westerton (already considered a large primary with 100 children per year group) is full with a considerable waiting list, Blackgates Primary has already been expanded to cope with the demand and has no further scope to expand even more. Secondary schools such as Woodkirk and Morley Academy are full with waiting lists. Leeds City Council are aware that there are not enough secondary school places available in this area for children already in the state school system and have granted authority to build a free school in Leeds City Centre (to open 01/09/14). With this in mind perhaps redevelopment of areas surrounding the City Centre or areas within the City Centre should be considered.

- Local Doctors surgeries are already full and continue to take on new patients.

Appointments are non-existent with most people having to go to drop in clinics to sit and wait (sometimes for up to 2 hours). This is hugely problematic for vulnerable patients (small children and the elderly) that sometimes require immediate attention. As for registering with a local NHS dentist— it's virtually impossible!

- Impact on environment. Planning permission stated that when our house was built (2008) the builders had to maintain the few trees between adjoining properties because of impact on the local environment and also to provide screening. Yet the same council with their new plans are happy to see the destruction of acres of protected trees and shrubs (Haigh Woods). This would have a huge impact on wildlife where we have a thriving bird population (which is currently in decline nationally) and a number of protected bats in the area. These birds and bats live/breed and feed in the zones currently highlighted for development. Tingley's green fields are already in decline, brownfield sites should be considered for redevelopment before we destroy our environment further. Planning permission for 20,000 houses have already been granted within the Leeds Area that haven't been built yet, surely these houses should be built and derelict areas redeveloped before we consider destroying green fields and wooded areas.

- The value of current properties will be greatly affected by the addition of housing on the sites stated. Currently Upper Green Drive is one of the most expensive streets for house prices in WF3, houses are built to a high standard and of similar size/value. When we purchased our house in 2008 we paid a premium rate which took into account not only the quality of the house but the area in which the house was situated (idyllic views of green fields and woods). The planned development would have a huge impact on property value and with most houses on the street having been newly built or recently purchased (valued according to the location/setting) there is a major concern that many families would face the possibility of negative equity. The current economic climate is already taking its toll on many families; this would further financially impact them.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1336

Housing

Westerton Road (land at), West Ardsley

Name: Amy Weatherhead

Representor No: PRS00951

Representation ID: REP02990 Question Ref: H1

3373a Upper Green, Tingley/3373c Upper Green Tingley/1336 Upper Green Tingley - Green to Red
SITE ALLOCATION CHANGES —SITE NUMBERS 3373A / 3373C / 1336

We are completely against the development of the above sites for a number of reasons, both personal and in the overall interest of the people living within Greater Morley.

- Access —Suggested access to the new sites through current 'Upper Green' roads would not be viable as road width/layout does not comply with planning requirements for a throughroad.

At present certain areas of the roads cannot accommodate two cars at the same time, more houses mean more traffic. This could lead to huge health and safety issues for motorists and pedestrians alike. Currently traffic on these roads are already at a high especially at peak times and the start and end of the school day (Westerton Primary is directly opposite upper green and is extremely busy at drop off and pick up times).

- Local framework —The local schools (both primary and secondary) are already full and have waiting lists for children already living in the area. Primary schools such as Westerton (already considered a large primary with 100 children per year group) is full with a considerable waiting list, Blackgates Primary has already been expanded to cope with the demand and has no further scope to expand even more. Secondary schools such as Woodkirk and Morley Academy are full with waiting lists. Leeds City Council are aware that there are not enough secondary school places available in this area for children already in the state school system and have granted authority to build a free school in Leeds City Centre (to open 01/09/14). With this in mind perhaps redevelopment of areas surrounding the City Centre or areas within the City Centre should be considered.

- Local Doctors surgeries are already full and continue to take on new patients.

Appointments are non-existent with most people having to go to drop in clinics to sit and wait (sometimes for up to 2 hours). This is hugely problematic for vulnerable patients (small children and the elderly) that sometimes require immediate attention. As for registering with a local NHS dentist— it's virtually impossible!

- Impact on environment. Planning permission stated that when our house was built (2008) the builders had to maintain the few trees between adjoining properties because of impact on the local environment and also to provide screening. Yet the same council with their new plans are happy to see the destruction of acres of protected trees and shrubs (Haigh Woods). This would have a huge impact on wildlife where we have a thriving bird population (which is currently in decline nationally) and a number of protected bats in the area. These birds and bats live/breed and feed in the zones currently highlighted for development. Tingley's green fields are already in decline, brownfield sites should be considered for redevelopment before we destroy our environment further. Planning permission for 20,000 houses have already been granted within the Leeds Area that haven't been built yet, surely these houses should be built and derelict areas redeveloped before we consider destroying green fields and wooded areas.

- The value of current properties will be greatly affected by the addition of housing on the sites stated. Currently Upper Green Drive is one of the most expensive streets for house prices in WF3, houses are built to a high standard and of similar size/value. When we purchased our house in 2008 we paid a premium rate which took into account not only the quality of the house but the area in which the house was situated (idyllic views of green fields and woods). The planned development would have a huge impact on property value and with most houses on the street having been newly built or recently purchased (valued according to the location/setting) there is a major concern that many families would face the possibility of negative equity. The current economic climate is already taking its toll on many families; this would further financially impact them.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1336

Housing

Westerton Road (land at), West Ardsley

Name: Andrew Weatherhead

Representor No: PRS00954

Representation ID: REP02993 Question Ref: H1

3373a Upper Green, Tingley/3373c Upper Green Tingley/1336 Upper Green Tingley - Green to Red
SITE ALLOCATION CHANGES —SITE NUMBERS 3373A / 3373C / 1336

We are completely against the development of the above sites for a number of reasons, both personal and in the overall interest of the people living within Greater Morley.

- Access —Suggested access to the new sites through current 'Upper Green' roads would not be viable as road width/layout does not comply with planning requirements for a throughroad.

At present certain areas of the roads cannot accommodate two cars at the same time, more houses mean more traffic. This could lead to huge health and safety issues for motorists and pedestrians alike. Currently traffic on these roads are already at a high especially at peak times and the start and end of the school day (Westerton Primary is directly opposite upper green and is extremely busy at drop off and pick up times).

- Local framework —The local schools (both primary and secondary) are already full and have waiting lists for children already living in the area. Primary schools such as Westerton (already considered a large primary with 100 children per year group) is full with a considerable waiting list, Blackgates Primary has already been expanded to cope with the demand and has no further scope to expand even more. Secondary schools such as Woodkirk and Morley Academy are full with waiting lists. Leeds City Council are aware that there are not enough secondary school places available in this area for children already in the state school system and have granted authority to build a free school in Leeds City Centre(to open 01/09/14). With this in mind perhaps redevelopment of areas surrounding the City Centre or areas within the City Centre should be considered.

- Local Doctors surgeries are already full and continue to take on new patients.

Appointments are non-existent with most people having to go to drop in clinics to sit and wait (sometimes for up to 2 hours). This is hugely problematic for vulnerable patients (small children and the elderly) that sometimes require immediate attention. As for registering with a local NHS dentist— it's virtually impossible!

- Impact on environment. Planning permission stated that when our house was built (2008) the builders had to maintain the few trees between adjoining properties because of impact on the local environment and also to provide screening. Yet the same council with their new plans are happy to see the destruction of acres of protected trees and shrubs (Haigh Woods). This would have a huge impact on wildlife where we have a thriving bird population (which is currently in decline nationally) and a number of protected bats in the area. These birds and bats live/breed and feed in the zones currently highlighted for development. Tingley's green fields are already in decline, brownfield sites should be considered for redevelopment before we destroy our environment further. Planning permission for 20,000 houses have already been granted within the Leeds Area that haven't been built yet, surely these houses should be built and derelict areas redeveloped before we consider destroying green fields and wooded areas.

- The value of current properties will be greatly affected by the addition of housing on the sites stated. Currently Upper Green Drive is one of the most expensive streets for house prices in WF3, houses are built to a high standard and of similar size/value. When we purchased our house in 2008 we paid a premium rate which took into account not only the quality of the house but the area in which the house was situated (idyllic views of green fields and woods). The planned development would have a huge impact on property value and with most houses on the street having been newly built or recently purchased (valued according to the location/setting) there is a major concern that many families would face the possibility of negative equity. The current economic climate is already taking its toll on many families; this would further financially impact them.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1336

Housing

Westerton Road (land at), West Ardsley

Name: Kim Weatherhead

Representor No: PRS00956

Representation ID: REP02995 Question Ref: H1

3373a Upper Green, Tingley/3373c Upper Green Tingley/1336 Upper Green Tingley - Green to Red
SITE ALLOCATION CHANGES —SITE NUMBERS 3373A / 3373C / 1336

We are completely against the development of the above sites for a number of reasons, both personal and in the overall interest of the people living within Greater Morley.

- Access —Suggested access to the new sites through current 'Upper Green' roads would not be viable as road width/layout does not comply with planning requirements for a throughroad.

At present certain areas of the roads cannot accommodate two cars at the same time, more houses mean more traffic. This could lead to huge health and safety issues for motorists and pedestrians alike. Currently traffic on these roads are already at a high especially at peak times and the start and end of the school day (Westerton Primary is directly opposite upper green and is extremely busy at drop off and pick up times).

- Local framework —The local schools (both primary and secondary) are already full and have waiting lists for children already living in the area. Primary schools such as Westerton (already considered a large primary with 100 children per year group) is full with a considerable waiting list, Blackgates Primary has already been expanded to cope with the demand and has no further scope to expand even more. Secondary schools such as Woodkirk and Morley Academy are full with waiting lists. Leeds City Council are aware that there are not enough secondary school places available in this area for children already in the state school system and have granted authority to build a free school in Leeds City Centre (to open 01/09/14). With this in mind perhaps redevelopment of areas surrounding the City Centre or areas within the City Centre should be considered.

- Local Doctors surgeries are already full and continue to take on new patients.

Appointments are non-existent with most people having to go to drop in clinics to sit and wait (sometimes for up to 2 hours). This is hugely problematic for vulnerable patients (small children and the elderly) that sometimes require immediate attention. As for registering with a local NHS dentist— it's virtually impossible!

- Impact on environment. Planning permission stated that when our house was built (2008) the builders had to maintain the few trees between adjoining properties because of impact on the local environment and also to provide screening. Yet the same council with their new plans are happy to see the destruction of acres of protected trees and shrubs (Haigh Woods). This would have a huge impact on wildlife where we have a thriving bird population (which is currently in decline nationally) and a number of protected bats in the area. These birds and bats live/breed and feed in the zones currently highlighted for development. Tingley's green fields are already in decline, brownfield sites should be considered for redevelopment before we destroy our environment further. Planning permission for 20,000 houses have already been granted within the Leeds Area that haven't been built yet, surely these houses should be built and derelict areas redeveloped before we consider destroying green fields and wooded areas.

- The value of current properties will be greatly affected by the addition of housing on the sites stated. Currently Upper Green Drive is one of the most expensive streets for house prices in WF3, houses are built to a high standard and of similar size/value. When we purchased our house in 2008 we paid a premium rate which took into account not only the quality of the house but the area in which the house was situated (idyllic views of green fields and woods). The planned development would have a huge impact on property value and with most houses on the street having been newly built or recently purchased (valued according to the location/setting) there is a major concern that many families would face the possibility of negative equity. The current economic climate is already taking its toll on many families; this would further financially impact them.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1336

Housing

Westerton Road (land at), West Ardsley

Name: M Bunney

Representor No: PRS00957

Representation ID: REP02997 Question Ref: H1

3373a Upper Green, Tingley/3373c Upper Green Tingley/1336 Upper Green Tingley - Green to Red
SITE ALLOCATION CHANGES —SITE NUMBERS 3373A / 3373C / 1336

We are completely against the development of the above sites for a number of reasons, both personal and in the overall interest of the people living within Greater Morley.

- Access —Suggested access to the new sites through current 'Upper Green' roads would not be viable as road width/layout does not comply with planning requirements for a throughroad.

At present certain areas of the roads cannot accommodate two cars at the same time, more houses mean more traffic. This could lead to huge health and safety issues for motorists and pedestrians alike. Currently traffic on these roads are already at a high especially at peak times and the start and end of the school day (Westerton Primary is directly opposite upper green and is extremely busy at drop off and pick up times).

- Local framework —The local schools (both primary and secondary) are already full and have waiting lists for children already living in the area. Primary schools such as Westerton (already considered a large primary with 100 children per year group) is full with a considerable waiting list, Blackgates Primary has already been expanded to cope with the demand and has no further scope to expand even more. Secondary schools such as Woodkirk and Morley Academy are full with waiting lists. Leeds City Council are aware that there are not enough secondary school places available in this area for children already in the state school system and have granted authority to build a free school in Leeds City Centre(to open 01/09/14). With this in mind perhaps redevelopment of areas surrounding the City Centre or areas within the City Centre should be considered.

- Local Doctors surgeries are already full and continue to take on new patients.

Appointments are non-existent with most people having to go to drop in clinics to sit and wait (sometimes for up to 2 hours). This is hugely problematic for vulnerable patients (small children and the elderly) that sometimes require immediate attention. As for registering with a local NHS dentist— it's virtually impossible!

- Impact on environment. Planning permission stated that when our house was built (2008) the builders had to maintain the few trees between adjoining properties because of impact on the local environment and also to provide screening. Yet the same council with their new plans are happy to see the destruction of acres of protected trees and shrubs (Haigh Woods). This would have a huge impact on wildlife where we have a thriving bird population (which is currently in decline nationally) and a number of protected bats in the area. These birds and bats live/breed and feed in the zones currently highlighted for development. Tingley's green fields are already in decline, brownfield sites should be considered for redevelopment before we destroy our environment further. Planning permission for 20,000 houses have already been granted within the Leeds Area that haven't been built yet, surely these houses should be built and derelict areas redeveloped before we consider destroying green fields and wooded areas.

- The value of current properties will be greatly affected by the addition of housing on the sites stated. Currently Upper Green Drive is one of the most expensive streets for house prices in WF3, houses are built to a high standard and of similar size/value. When we purchased our house in 2008 we paid a premium rate which took into account not only the quality of the house but the area in which the house was situated (idyllic views of green fields and woods). The planned development would have a huge impact on property value and with most houses on the street having been newly built or recently purchased (valued according to the location/setting) there is a major concern that many families would face the possibility of negative equity. The current economic climate is already taking its toll on many families; this would further financially impact them.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1336

Housing

Westerton Road (land at), West Ardsley

Name: Daniel Newsome

Representor No: PRS00958

Representation ID: REP02999 Question Ref: H1

3373a Upper Green, Tingley/3373c Upper Green Tingley/1336 Upper Green Tingley - Green to Red
SITE ALLOCATION CHANGES —SITE NUMBERS 3373A / 3373C / 1336

We are completely against the development of the above sites for a number of reasons, both personal and in the overall interest of the people living within Greater Morley.

- Access —Suggested access to the new sites through current 'Upper Green' roads would not be viable as road width/layout does not comply with planning requirements for a throughroad.

At present certain areas of the roads cannot accommodate two cars at the same time, more houses mean more traffic. This could lead to huge health and safety issues for motorists and pedestrians alike. Currently traffic on these roads are already at a high especially at peak times and the start and end of the school day (Westerton Primary is directly opposite upper green and is extremely busy at drop off and pick up times).

- Local framework —The local schools (both primary and secondary) are already full and have waiting lists for children already living in the area. Primary schools such as Westerton (already considered a large primary with 100 children per year group) is full with a considerable waiting list, Blackgates Primary has already been expanded to cope with the demand and has no further scope to expand even more. Secondary schools such as Woodkirk and Morley Academy are full with waiting lists. Leeds City Council are aware that there are not enough secondary school places available in this area for children already in the state school system and have granted authority to build a free school in Leeds City Centre(to open 01/09/14). With this in mind perhaps redevelopment of areas surrounding the City Centre or areas within the City Centre should be considered.

- Local Doctors surgeries are already full and continue to take on new patients.

Appointments are non-existent with most people having to go to drop in clinics to sit and wait (sometimes for up to 2 hours). This is hugely problematic for vulnerable patients (small children and the elderly) that sometimes require immediate attention. As for registering with a local NHS dentist— it's virtually impossible!

- Impact on environment. Planning permission stated that when our house was built (2008) the builders had to maintain the few trees between adjoining properties because of impact on the local environment and also to provide screening. Yet the same council with their new plans are happy to see the destruction of acres of protected trees and shrubs (Haigh Woods). This would have a huge impact on wildlife where we have a thriving bird population (which is currently in decline nationally) and a number of protected bats in the area. These birds and bats live/breed and feed in the zones currently highlighted for development. Tingley's green fields are already in decline, brownfield sites should be considered for redevelopment before we destroy our environment further. Planning permission for 20,000 houses have already been granted within the Leeds Area that haven't been built yet, surely these houses should be built and derelict areas redeveloped before we consider destroying green fields and wooded areas.

- The value of current properties will be greatly affected by the addition of housing on the sites stated. Currently Upper Green Drive is one of the most expensive streets for house prices in WF3, houses are built to a high standard and of similar size/value. When we purchased our house in 2008 we paid a premium rate which took into account not only the quality of the house but the area in which the house was situated (idyllic views of green fields and woods). The planned development would have a huge impact on property value and with most houses on the street having been newly built or recently purchased (valued according to the location/setting) there is a major concern that many families would face the possibility of negative equity. The current economic climate is already taking its toll on many families; this would further financially impact them.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1336

Housing

Westerton Road (land at), West Ardsley

Name: Tom Newsome

Representor No: PRS00960

Representation ID: REP03000 Question Ref: H1

3373a Upper Green, Tingley/3373c Upper Green Tingley/1336 Upper Green Tingley - Green to Red
SITE ALLOCATION CHANGES —SITE NUMBERS 3373A / 3373C / 1336

We are completely against the development of the above sites for a number of reasons, both personal and in the overall interest of the people living within Greater Morley.

- Access —Suggested access to the new sites through current 'Upper Green' roads would not be viable as road width/layout does not comply with planning requirements for a throughroad.

At present certain areas of the roads cannot accommodate two cars at the same time, more houses mean more traffic. This could lead to huge health and safety issues for motorists and pedestrians alike. Currently traffic on these roads are already at a high especially at peak times and the start and end of the school day (Westerton Primary is directly opposite upper green and is extremely busy at drop off and pick up times).

- Local framework —The local schools (both primary and secondary) are already full and have waiting lists for children already living in the area. Primary schools such as Westerton (already considered a large primary with 100 children per year group) is full with a considerable waiting list, Blackgates Primary has already been expanded to cope with the demand and has no further scope to expand even more. Secondary schools such as Woodkirk and Morley Academy are full with waiting lists. Leeds City Council are aware that there are not enough secondary school places available in this area for children already in the state school system and have granted authority to build a free school in Leeds City Centre(to open 01/09/14). With this in mind perhaps redevelopment of areas surrounding the City Centre or areas within the City Centre should be considered.

- Local Doctors surgeries are already full and continue to take on new patients.

Appointments are non-existent with most people having to go to drop in clinics to sit and wait (sometimes for up to 2 hours). This is hugely problematic for vulnerable patients (small children and the elderly) that sometimes require immediate attention. As for registering with a local NHS dentist— it's virtually impossible!

- Impact on environment. Planning permission stated that when our house was built (2008) the builders had to maintain the few trees between adjoining properties because of impact on the local environment and also to provide screening. Yet the same council with their new plans are happy to see the destruction of acres of protected trees and shrubs (Haigh Woods). This would have a huge impact on wildlife where we have a thriving bird population (which is currently in decline nationally) and a number of protected bats in the area. These birds and bats live/breed and feed in the zones currently highlighted for development. Tingley's green fields are already in decline, brownfield sites should be considered for redevelopment before we destroy our environment further. Planning permission for 20,000 houses have already been granted within the Leeds Area that haven't been built yet, surely these houses should be built and derelict areas redeveloped before we consider destroying green fields and wooded areas.

- The value of current properties will be greatly affected by the addition of housing on the sites stated. Currently Upper Green Drive is one of the most expensive streets for house prices in WF3, houses are built to a high standard and of similar size/value. When we purchased our house in 2008 we paid a premium rate which took into account not only the quality of the house but the area in which the house was situated (idyllic views of green fields and woods). The planned development would have a huge impact on property value and with most houses on the street having been newly built or recently purchased (valued according to the location/setting) there is a major concern that many families would face the possibility of negative equity. The current economic climate is already taking its toll on many families; this would further financially impact them.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1336

Housing

Westerton Road (land at), West Ardsley

Name: J Newsome

Representor No: PRS00961

Representation ID: REP03002 Question Ref: H1

3373a Upper Green, Tingley/3373c Upper Green Tingley/1336 Upper Green Tingley - Green to Red
SITE ALLOCATION CHANGES —SITE NUMBERS 3373A / 3373C / 1336

We are completely against the development of the above sites for a number of reasons, both personal and in the overall interest of the people living within Greater Morley.

- Access —Suggested access to the new sites through current 'Upper Green' roads would not be viable as road width/layout does not comply with planning requirements for a throughroad.

At present certain areas of the roads cannot accommodate two cars at the same time, more houses mean more traffic. This could lead to huge health and safety issues for motorists and pedestrians alike. Currently traffic on these roads are already at a high especially at peak times and the start and end of the school day (Westerton Primary is directly opposite upper green and is extremely busy at drop off and pick up times).

- Local framework —The local schools (both primary and secondary) are already full and have waiting lists for children already living in the area. Primary schools such as Westerton (already considered a large primary with 100 children per year group) is full with a considerable waiting list, Blackgates Primary has already been expanded to cope with the demand and has no further scope to expand even more. Secondary schools such as Woodkirk and Morley Academy are full with waiting lists. Leeds City Council are aware that there are not enough secondary school places available in this area for children already in the state school system and have granted authority to build a free school in Leeds City Centre(to open 01/09/14). With this in mind perhaps redevelopment of areas surrounding the City Centre or areas within the City Centre should be considered.

- Local Doctors surgeries are already full and continue to take on new patients.

Appointments are non-existent with most people having to go to drop in clinics to sit and wait (sometimes for up to 2 hours). This is hugely problematic for vulnerable patients (small children and the elderly) that sometimes require immediate attention. As for registering with a local NHS dentist— it's virtually impossible!

- Impact on environment. Planning permission stated that when our house was built (2008) the builders had to maintain the few trees between adjoining properties because of impact on the local environment and also to provide screening. Yet the same council with their new plans are happy to see the destruction of acres of protected trees and shrubs (Haigh Woods). This would have a huge impact on wildlife where we have a thriving bird population (which is currently in decline nationally) and a number of protected bats in the area. These birds and bats live/breed and feed in the zones currently highlighted for development. Tingley's green fields are already in decline, brownfield sites should be considered for redevelopment before we destroy our environment further. Planning permission for 20,000 houses have already been granted within the Leeds Area that haven't been built yet, surely these houses should be built and derelict areas redeveloped before we consider destroying green fields and wooded areas.

- The value of current properties will be greatly affected by the addition of housing on the sites stated. Currently Upper Green Drive is one of the most expensive streets for house prices in WF3, houses are built to a high standard and of similar size/value. When we purchased our house in 2008 we paid a premium rate which took into account not only the quality of the house but the area in which the house was situated (idyllic views of green fields and woods). The planned development would have a huge impact on property value and with most houses on the street having been newly built or recently purchased (valued according to the location/setting) there is a major concern that many families would face the possibility of negative equity. The current economic climate is already taking its toll on many families; this would further financially impact them.

Name: Amy Weldon

Representor No: PRS00980

Representation ID: REP03023 Question Ref: H1

1336 Westerton Road - Green to Red

Full schools, full doctors - schools and facilities already at full capacity, roads congested

Name: S Fothergill

Representor No: PRS00984

Representation ID: REP03028 Question Ref: H1

1336 Westerton Road - Green to Red (Assumed)

Green Belt should be left alone . Too many green belt spaces are being over developed leaving no space for recreation and leisure.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1336

Housing

Westerton Road (land at), West Ardsley

Name: S Milner

Representor No: PRS01004

Representation ID: REP03053 Question Ref: H1

1336, Tingley - Green to Red
Out of character with area
Drainage is poor, always flooding

Name: Fran Mcknight

Representor No: PRS01009

Representation ID: REP03060 Question Ref: H1

1330b, 1336, 3373a - Green to Red
Extra traffic will cause a danger to children playing .
Drainage in area is already poor.
Endangering wildlife.
Schools becoming overcrowded.
Out of character with area.

Name: Lynne Watson

Representor No: PRS01020

Representation ID: REP03075 Question Ref: H1

1330b, 1336, 3373a - Green to Red
Current drainage in the area is not sufficient, causing flooding in Westerton Road. Further housing development will exacerbate the problem.
Extra traffic will be created by this development as the current bus services are insufficient .
The proposed site will decimate a natural environment for small mammals, birds and other wildlife.

Name: Judith Blades

Representor No: PRS01026

Representation ID: REP03084 Question Ref: H1

1336 Westerton Road - Green to Red (assumed)
Congestion for school.

Name: Simon Mcknight

Representor No: PRS01032

Representation ID: REP03091 Question Ref: H1

1330b, 1336, 3373a Green to Red
Damage to fields, bats in the field, poor drainage, danger to local wildlife. Out of character with area.

Name: Jean Dawson

Representor No: PRS01045

Representation ID: REP03103 Question Ref: H1

1336 Haigh Moor Road - Green to Red
Schools are full, roads are crowded.
I was born in West Ardsley as was my father and grandfather. It has already been spoilt by over building. In the last five years it has become unrecognisable as a village.

Name: Alan Weldon

Representor No: PRS01062

Representation ID: REP03126 Question Ref: H1

1336 Westerton Road - Green to Red

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1336

Housing

Westerton Road (land at), West Ardsley

Name: H I Weldon

Representor No: PRS01063

Representation ID: REP03127 Question Ref: H1

1336 Westerton Road - Green to Red

Name: G Fothergill

Representor No: PRS01131

Representation ID: REP03204 Question Ref: H1

1336 Off Westerton Road - Amber to Green stated Green to Red assumed
Left Green belt - should be left an open space

Name: Michael Stilwell

Representor No: PRS01133

Representation ID: REP03207 Question Ref: H1

1336

Lack of amenities – the amenities in the area cannot support the existing population of West Ardsley, never mind accepting an influx of possibly 5000 more.

- Virtually all the shops have closed over the years, there are now only 3 grocery shops in the area. Anyone living at the southern end of Haigh Moor Road has over 1 mile to travel to the nearest shop.

- The schools are overcrowded, Westerton Road has had more external classrooms added, so it cannot be extended. Hill Top School is nearly full now from the existing population growth, again it is extremely limited in expansion possibilities.

- Bus services are pathetic, services to Leeds, Dewsbury and Wakefield are hourly at best. Batley is only accessible from Wakefield –Batley Road. There are areas where buses have been removed completely. This week another service has been stopped.

- There are not any play areas for children, your own survey records this failing.

- There is only one medical centre with 8 doctors giving cover to some existing 15000 patients. To get an appointment with a specific GP can take 3 weeks, the centre has recently been extended to its limits so there is nowhere to go. Also there is only one pharmacist.

Traffic

All the roads in the area are in a bad state of repair, I have lived here for 28 years and Haigh Moor Road has never been resurfaced despite 3 new housing estates accessing it. In June 1992 the planning inspector denied a planning application (91/23/00350) for an annex for an invalid because although neither he nor his brother drove. The reason for this was "I am concerned that were an additional dwelling to be provided there would be no guarantee that it would not lead to additional traffic generation at some future time, perhaps through changed circumstances, with consequent adverse impact on highway safety." Yet here we are with a further 70 houses at Foxfields and Jude's Pond and a proposed 179 on these new sites, probably adding in excess of 500 vehicles to Haigh Moor Road.

There has been a water leak on HMR which despite being reported to Yorkshire Water is still flowing after 3 months and has now become 2 leaks. The western end of Westerton Road is in a dangerous state with potholes and speed restriction bumps. LCC appears to be unable to keep up with the maintenance of its roads in South Leeds.

LCC's attitude to this area seems to be that Ardsley is an outpost on the borders with Wakefield and Kirklees and beyond the borough or Morley, so we can be conveniently ignored. Ardsley is quite definitely being asked to provide the lion's share of new housing without any benefit, it has poor services and has become a dormitory area of Leeds.

Name: Des McCleave

Representor No: PRS01160

Representation ID: REP03250 Question Ref: H1

1336 Westerton Road -Green to Red
Additional dwellings will increase already overpopulated schools in this area.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1336

Housing

Westerton Road (land at), West Ardsley

Name: Mavis Sherburn

Representor No: PRS01287

Representation ID: REP03396 Question Ref: H1

3112/3111/110/1044/3113
1336/2132/3114/1165/2156
2032/2091/1004

The building of any large housing developments will only add to the existing problems.
PARKING - A resident for 55 years and I have difficulty finding a space - I like to shop locally and support local businesses
SCHOOLS - Will be a lack of places. Primary and Junior children should not have to travel miles for their education.
MEDICAL PRACTICES, DENTISTS - Some are already over subscribed so this will cause problems
TRANSPORT - Our roads will not be to cope with the influx.

Representation ID: REP03396 Question Ref: H4

3112/3111/110/1044/3113
1336/2132/3114/1165/2156
2032/2091/1004

The building of any large housing developments will only add to the existing problems.
PARKING - A resident for 55 years and I have difficulty finding a space - I like to shop locally and support local businesses
SCHOOLS - Will be a lack of places. Primary and Junior children should not have to travel miles for their education.
MEDICAL PRACTICES, DENTISTS - Some are already over subscribed so this will cause problems
TRANSPORT - Our roads will not be to cope with the influx.

Name: George Stephenson

Representor No: PRS01313

Representation ID: REP03425 Question Ref: H4

1100 / 1044 / 1336 -

I am amazed that you are proposing to have a major build on the Garforth green belt (ref: Wakefield Road / Barrowby Lane and Selby Road plus Barwick Road. You cannot be aware the problems this will cause to Garforth.

1. Even now the traffic bottlenecks at peak times on:-
 - a. A642 and Garforth Main Street
 - b. Selby road A63 leading up to the Old George public house and roundabout and up to the traffic lights at the Lidgett Lane junction.
2. Our services will be overloaded – such as school places, health care plus the ever present problem of parking when shopping in Garforth.
3. Apparently, there is no need for a local travellers site which we wholeheartedly agree with. The Cottingley Springs site in Leeds should offer sufficient provision.
4. We seem to have been the dumping ground for extended building including the industrial site at East Garforth plus the re-routing of the M1 which skirts three sides of Garforth. One of the original routes was between Scholes and Barwick which was the logical route to avoid traffic through Cross gates. Now to rectify this bad error another bypass is to be built (crossing Swillington Common) to ease the Crossgates congestion.
5. Garforth is already a large built up area. It is essential that a green belt corridor is kept between the East of Leeds and Garforth.
6. Already there can be major flooding particularly at the Old George roundabout what do you intend to do about this taking account that the drainage of the land bordering Wakefield Road will be seriously impeded by extensive building?
7. A development of a new settlement on the land off Ridge Road (which is known as Makins farmland) and close to the Peckfield roundabout (site ref: 1232) would allow a green belt corridor between Garforth and the new development.
8. What Garforth really needs is a natural parkland and the agricultural land bordering the Wakefield Road is ideal, currently we only have playing field areas – no specific park, and we were amazed when part of Gletelands was taken to extend the burial site.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1336

Housing

Westerton Road (land at), West Ardsley

Name: Kathryn Sherburn

Representor No: PRS01372

Representation ID: REP03496 Question Ref: H4

3112/3111/1100/1044/3113

1336/2132/3114/1165/2156

2032/2091/1004

1232

Please note the following comments apply to all site proposals and my objectives against all of them. I have many concerns over the planned proposals, which some are going to have adverse affects on Garforth, which is already under pressure with traffic congestion - back to school places, dental places and doctor practices.

Traffic congestion is already a big problem it can take me 10-15 mins to get out of Garforth in a morning to do just a 10 mile journey to work.

I was born and grew up in Garforth and the dramatic changes already affecting Garforth are difficult to live with without the added difficulties you will be imposing with the proposed plans. This cannot be productive for the residents of Garforth or appealing for anyone wanting to move to Garforth.

I am currently 16 weeks pregnant (my first) and have many concerns and worries about the possibilities of not been able to provide a local education and health care for my child. I would not be able to afford costs to go elsewhere for this.

Garforth is already known for flooding and what implications will all the building have in this?? And the wildlife will *empty* in Garforth - please don't eliminate this.

Why are you not supporting the current residents? Why build more houses when the housing market in Garforth are not selling anyway.

The natural boundary of the village needs to remain intact. Please please reconsider these proposals and consider a new settlement on the land off Ridge Road - Site 1232. Please listen to the residents of Garforth and support us.

Name: James Pow

Representor No: PRS01505

Representation ID: REP03644 Question Ref: H1

1336 GREEN TO RED, We oppose the development of the above sites for the following reasons;

1. The current roads on the upper Green estate will not be able to cope with an increase in traffic. In particular, the junction of the upper green way and upper green drive is already very dangerous. Cars tend to have to use the middle of the road to get around the corner and people who live on the immediate estate are aware they have to slow down and be mindful of oncoming cars and children playing in the proximity. An increase in traffic is highly likely to cause a serious accident on this bend. The junction of Westerton Road and upper green way already come to a complete standstill at the start and end of the school day.
2. Primary schools and high schools in the area oversubscribed and have waiting lists. Westerton primary school is the nearest school to the proposed development and is the largest primary school in Leeds.
3. The fields on the proposed development are currently used to grow crops for food. The woodland area is used by the local people for recreation.
4. The destruction of protected trees and shrubs would have a negative effect on wildlife.
5. The local healthcare facilities are currently at full capacity.
6. There is little employment within walking distance from the proposed development.

We consider that additional housing should not be built on greenbelt land. Instead brownfield sites should be used where wildlife, agricultural land and woodland would not be affected and the infrastructure would be more suitable.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1336

Housing

Westerton Road (land at), West Ardsley

Name: Tim Chapman

Representor No: PRS01644

Representation ID: REP03799 Question Ref: H1

1336 / 1258 / 1032 / 3365 / 1143B / 1143D I am making my response by letter; the online boxes rejected my comments because they exceed 3,000 digits.

3373A Haigh Wood, West Ardsley, 3373C Haigh Wood, West Ardsley,
1336 Westerton Road, West Ardsley, 3456A Ardsley Reservoir,
1258 Westerton Road, Tingley, 3365 Westerton Road, Tingley,
1032 Bradford Road, 1143B & 1143D Thorpe Lane, Tingley.
Ob ections.

The Core Strategy seeks to be "fair". The word is used in paragraph 1.2 and again in 1.14. Yet the proposed green housing sites when taken together would definitely not be fair to West Ardsley and Tingley. No justification has been given as to why there is such a concentration here, nor any evidence of local need. Indeed, paragraph 4.6.14 states that "The SHMA 2011 was not able to identify any geographically specific need for new housing based on population growth." The 13 green housing sites in Ardsley and Tingley seem to have been assessed individually rather than their cumulative impact. This impact is potentially very much greater when considered alongside Kirklees Council's proposals for the Chidswell area, and comes on top of the huge impact on West Ardsley of major housing development in the 1990s - the estates now accessed by Lowry Road and Constable Road. The newly proposed sites taken together would consolidate semi-rural groups of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area. Most of the open frontages to Bradford Road and Westerton Road would be built on, removing open aspects and distant views and tending towards the creation of amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the length of the A650.

Representation ID: REP05648 Question Ref: H1

Local Development Framework, Site Allocations Plan, Public Consultation.

I am making my response by letter; the online boxes rejected my comments because they exceed 3,000 digits.

3373A Haigh Wood, West Ardsley, 3373C Haigh Wood, West Ardsley,
1336 Westerton Road, West Ardsley, 3456A Ardsley Reservoir,
1258 Westerton Road, Tingley, 3365 Westerton Road, Tingley,
1032 Bradford Road, 1143B & 1143D Thorpe Lane, Tingley.

Objections.

The Core Strategy seeks to be "fair". The word is used in paragraph 1.2 and again in 1.14. Yet the proposed green housing sites when taken together would definitely not be fair to West Ardsley and Tingley. No justification has been given as to why there is such a concentration here, nor any evidence of local need. Indeed, paragraph 4.6.14 states that "The SHMA 2011 was not able to identify any geographically specific need for new housing based on population growth." The 13 green housing sites in Ardsley and Tingley seem to have been assessed individually rather than their cumulative impact. This impact is potentially very much greater when considered alongside Kirklees Council's proposals for the Chidswell area, and comes on top of the huge impact on West Ardsley of major housing development in the 1990s - the estates now accessed by Lowry Road and Constable Road. The newly proposed sites taken together would consolidate semi-rural groups of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area. Most of the open frontages to Bradford Road and Westerton Road would be built on, removing open aspects and distant views and tending towards the creation of amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the length of the A650.

Name: Nicola Allan

Representor No: PRS02112

Representation ID: REP04333 Question Ref: H1

1100 / 1044 / 1336 -

I have lived in Garforth all my life and seen it grow into a sizeable town, much bigger than its original intention. I have also witnessed the increased traffic and congestion, demand and refusal of school places – particularly at primary level, the waiting lists and times of doctors and dentists and feel increasing the number of houses by another 4500 is unacceptable to local resources.

Name: Sally Hansell

Representor No: PRS02133

Representation ID: REP04356 Question Ref: H1

1100 / 1044 / 1336

I would like to submit my objections to the proposed plans to build near Wakefield Road / Barrowby Lane in Garforth, Barwick Road and Selby Road. It is unimaginable to me that LCC would consider such a large plan to build on the green belt. LCC is more than aware of the huge flooding risks we face in Garforth – I can only assume that those who wish to pass this plan have never been flooded in their homes? It is not just a disruption to living arrangements, or a question of 'drying out' what has been damaged – this is a physical and emotional challenge to all of us affected. It is something that causes worry and concern every time bad weather is forecast. To add so many more homes to the already compromised drainage system shows a complete disrespect to your current residents and it is shameful on LCC to propose plans that are a given in regards to creating more flood risk areas and increased damage to those properties already affected by flooding. It will also be a massive impact on our surrounding countryside – this is what makes Garforth the stand alone town it is. Do you really want to join us on to an already sprawling city? Has LCC no regard for history, for the countryside or for individuality? Please re think your proposed plans.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1336

Housing

Westerton Road (land at), West Ardsley

Name: John Spence

Representor No: PRS02593

Representation ID: REP04891 Question Ref: H4

Any sort of building along the Selby Road corridor in Garforth would cause major traffic problems as this road is already so busy that I queue along this road every morning and evening just to get to work and home. Why do we need any more retail development when just up the road is Colton Retail Park and under used Main Street.

Name: Cynthia Meyers

Representor No: PRS02667

Representation ID: REP05116 Question Ref: H1

Selby Road 1336-2132
As above.....Why make it living in Garforth unpleasant for people who have lived here for many years.....
We have to put up with enough already!!! Why was this only put through odd letterboxes and so very late?

Name: Barbara Halliday

Representor No: PRS02677

Representation ID: REP05128 Question Ref: H1

Selby Road 1336/2132
Borders around Garforth would vanish and impact on wildlife and plants etc. Impact on school requirements, doctors, dentists, would be too high for this area to sustain demand for public services, Policing, Fire Services would increase to sky high levels. Some areas it is not known what lies underneath, where old coalmine workings are, swampy ground.

Name: Cyril Raymond Toft

Representor No: PRS02680

Representation ID: REP05132 Question Ref: H1

2 Selby Road 1336/2132
As I am sure many people will have pointed out about flooding at Garforth Bridge. What impact will another 4,000 plus buildings have on the flooding? If this goes ahead, where will all the cars etc park in Garforth when they try to get to shops or doctors and dentists etc. On that site what has been proposed there are many wild plants and birds that are almost extinct.

Name: Joan Waring

Representor No: PRS02759

Representation ID: REP05292 Question Ref: H1

The optional site would be more acceptable. Natural boundary should be retained or we will lose our identity which is so important to a happy community. A lovely park and a lake where children could play and with rowing boats and a sports facility, we have absolutely nothing here, no wonder the youth go to pubs and drink, what else is there

Name: Lynn Langley

Representor No: PRS02840

Representation ID: REP05390 Question Ref: H1

Traffic levels at peak times are already very heavy, this will cause many more problems on a very busy road.

Name: Annie McNally

Representor No: PRS03059

Representation ID: REP00387 Question Ref: G1

I think it is disgusting that the council are wanting to build on greenbelt land on proposed Plots 1336, 3373, 3372, 3373A, 3373B, 3373C, 1330B, 1330A, 536. And 3456A. It is an area of outstanding beauty where people enjoy walking, running, playing and riding horses. Many wild animals live in the fields and to take it away would turn this area into a concrete jungle. It would mean my view at the back would be eradicated, lowering the value of my house, but more importantly the pleasure I have everyday when I look across the field. This city needs green areas where we can walk and get away from the stresses of life. Also, to the rear of my property there is bindweed in the field which I believe would make it difficult for any developers to be able to build on that land. There are plenty of brown field sites which can be developed. Do not take away our green spaces. Totally outrageous.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1336

Housing

Westerton Road (land at), West Ardsley

Name: Molly Hiron

Representor No: PRS03280

Representation ID: REP01471 Question Ref: H5

1100 / 1044 / 3111 / 3112 / 3113 / 1336 / 2132 / 3114 / 1165 2156The building of housing on these sights would add to the traffic congestion in Garforth. The roundabout at the junction of A63 Selby Road and A642 Wakefield Road is often congested and is also liable to flooding. It simple would not cope with increased volumes of traffic. Motorists already use Ringway as a rat run to avoid this junction and the queues that form on A63 & A642. The schools in Garforth would not be able to accommodate the influx of new families. Children living in these new homes would be nearer to the schools than many of the children already living in Garforth and therefore would be given priority when allocating school places. It is not fair that children whose parents and grandparents have lived in Garforth for many years should have to travel out side Garforth for education. Healthcare services in Garforth are already at breaking point. Dentists are already having to refuse NHS patients, even children. The existing GPs would not be able to cope with all the additional people.

Representation ID: REP01471 Question Ref: H2

1100 / 1044 / 3111 / 3112 / 3113 / 1336 / 2132 / 3114 / 1165 2156The building of housing on these sights would add to the traffic congestion in Garforth. The roundabout at the junction of A63 Selby Road and A642 Wakefield Road is often congested and is also liable to flooding. It simple would not cope with increased volumes of traffic. Motorists already use Ringway as a rat run to avoid this junction and the queues that form on A63 & A642. The schools in Garforth would not be able to accommodate the influx of new families. Children living in these new homes would be nearer to the schools than many of the children already living in Garforth and therefore would be given priority when allocating school places. It is not fair that children whose parents and grandparents have lived in Garforth for many years should have to travel out side Garforth for education. Healthcare services in Garforth are already at breaking point. Dentists are already having to refuse NHS patients, even children. The existing GPs would not be able to cope with all the additional people.

Name: Steven Beattie

Representor No: PRS03334

Representation ID: REP01047 Question Ref: General comment

I would like to reiterate that we strongly object to the developments of properties on site references: 1336 and 2132.

Name: Michael Short

Representor No: PRS03336

Representation ID: REP00155 Question Ref: H2

3373A: suggested access via narrow, badly designed estate roads which are about adequate to service the existing housing. The site, in parts, is probably not economical to develop (topography, drainage, old mines etc). Will entail removal of many trees which form part of a pleasant, wooded local amenity. If developed, the character of this space (a quiet valley) will be ruined. Applying to 3373A and also 3373C, 1336 and 1337: Local roads already saturated, no places in schools or GPs, massive development will ruin the 'village' feel of the area.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1336

Housing

Westerton Road (land at), West Ardsley

Name: Richard Sagar

Representor No: PRS03405

Representation ID: REP01941 Question Ref: H1

Whilst we are in broad agreement with the designation of green sites at Haigh Wood in the Outer South West area of Leeds, we have concerns regarding the boundaries between the 'green' and 'red' sites. We agree with and support the allocation of land at Haigh Wood for housing with a central area in the vicinity of Haigh Wood LNA left undisturbed, but feel that this primary objective can be better achieved with different boundaries to sites 3373A, 3373B, 3373C and 1336

Representation ID: REP01941 Question Ref: H3

As a corollary to the explanation provided at H2 and in the attached document, we suggest that parts of site 3373B be re-designated as green, in accordance with Figure 6 and Appendix 1 of that document. These sections are in areas which are not needed to be kept undeveloped for the preservation of the green corridor between the two development parcels. New access points, via Upper Green Avenue/Upper Green Way and a new junction onto Westerton Road will facilitate improved integration into the transport network. As mentioned above, the alignment of site 3373B would be more logical if it followed the suggested revised indicative masterplan included in the attached document (at Figure 6 and Appendix 1). The green corridor will be further protected by the removal of the previously suggested vehicular link road between the two parts of the Haigh Wood site. The new alignment will preserve the vast majority of the hedges and existing trees on the site, whilst allowing a more logical and achievable layout for future development. Additionally, no development is proposed within the vicinity of the LNA or the stream running down the valley.

Representation ID: REP01941 Question Ref: H8

As explained at H3 and in the attached documents, we believe that sections of site 3337B should be re-designated as green, instead of parts of site 1336 and 3373A.

Representation ID: REP01941 Question Ref: H9

As explained at H2 and in the attached documents, we suggest that parts of sites 1336 and 3373A would be more suitable for colour coding as red, whilst parts of site 3373B should be green.

Representation ID: REP01941 Question Ref: H11

The suggested revised allocations at Haigh Wood (see Figure 6 and Appendix 1 of the attached document) ('green' land) are all suitable for short term delivery.

Representation ID: REP01941 Question Ref: H2

We agree with the Council that the central valley at Haigh Wood should be excluded from development, as a green corridor between proposed development sites. This was the Council's intention in designating site 3373B as red. However, the alignment of the valley suggested by site 3373B does not accurately reflect the topography of the area, the trees, the stream and the LNA and how these will affect potential development, nor does it align with what we suggest is the true extent of the central valley. We therefore suggest that sections of sites 3373A and 1336 be re-designated as red, in accordance with the attached documents (Document for Residential and Open Space Allocation Addendum dated July 2013, in particular Figure 6 and Appendix 1, and the covering letter) outlining the detailed justification for our proposed new alignment for the central valley. The sections of sites 3373A and 1336 which we suggest are re-designated as red are not suitable for development, as they incorporate important arboricultural features which will be difficult to incorporate into a housing development and are best left as part of the green corridor between the two development parcels. Conversely, parts of site 3373B should be added as green, not red, for similar reasons, but in reverse; the area can be developed without harm to what is sought to be protected, as further explained below.

Name: Sara Stevenson

Representor No: PRS03542

Representation ID: REP00948 Question Ref: H2

Site ref 3112/3111/1100/1044/3113/1336/2132/3114/1165/2156/2032/2091/1004 The proposed new housing will have a detrimental effect on the look of Garforth, ruining the open aspect. It will also impact greatly on resources for schooling & transport. It will increase congestion of traffic at peak times. It will put additional demand on public services in the area.

Name: Joanne Hewson

Representor No: PRS03571

Representation ID: REP01921 Question Ref: H1

I feel there are better sites available than those proposed.

Representation ID: REP01921 Question Ref: H2

3112 3111 1100 1044 3113 1336 2132 3114 1165 2156 2032 2091 1004. There are a number of reasons why the sites above are not suitable but my main concerns are increased traffic levels especially around the Fairburn Drive and Thames Drive area, further drain on resources such as healthcare services, and school places. There is a better option, site ref 1232. This option would negate some of the above issues yet still provide further housing, which I appreciate is required.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1336

Housing

Westerton Road (land at), West Ardsley

Name: John Rock

Representor No: PRS03633

Representation ID: REP01293 Question Ref: H12

3112/3111/1100/1044/3113/2156/1165/3114/1336/2132.WE HAVE ALREADY HAD MAJOR PROBLEMS WITH TRAVELLERS SETTING UP ILLEGAL CAMPS IN THE AREA AND WHILST I ACCEPT THAT NOT ALL TRAVELLERS ARE BAD I CAN ONLY BASE MY OPINION ON PERSONAL EXPERIENCE

Representation ID: REP01293 Question Ref: H2

1336/2132There is already severe traffic congestion mainly caused by a new site on Selby Road.Queues stretching from the Old George roundabout to the top of Garforth Cliff which hve a knock on effect causing traffic entering Selby Road from Kippax to back up severely.1100/1044/3113These areas regularly flood causing major flooding and road closures causing even more severe traffic problems.3112/3111/1100/1044/3113/1336/2132/3114/1165/2156/2032/2091/1004. The increase in population would but an overwhelming demand on schools,dentists and doctors in the area it is already very difficult to get doctor and dentist appointments.

Name: Susan Allan

Representor No: PRS03678

Representation ID: REP01179 Question Ref: H5

3112/3111/1100/1044/31131336/21323114/1165/2156The infrastructure of Garforth cannot cope with 3500 new homes. School places and doctors and dental services are already oversubscribed. Consideration needs to be given how all Garforth children can be guaranteed to get a place in a Garforth school; more new homes make it likely that children will have go to schools out of their local area.

Representation ID: REP01179 Question Ref: H2

3112/3111/1100/1044/31131336/21323114/1165/2156The sheer volume of new housing planned would put severe pressure on the existing infrastructure of Garforth. I believe school and NHS provision, already under pressure, should be considered when assisting the viability of any plans for new housing.

Name: Rchard Weatherill

Representor No: PRS03901

Representation ID: REP01015 Question Ref: H2

Selby Road. Reference 1336/2132Barwick Road.reference 3114/1165/2156.The roads these sites would be built on are struggling to cope with the present levels of traffic. More traffic volume would cause long delays and air pollution issues. Selby road is a main route to Garforth Academy for many of the students. The speed limit on this road has recently been lowered from 40mph, to 30mph. Reflecting how dangerous this stretch can be for those walking to school.

Name: Stephen Smith

Representor No: PRS04012

Representation ID: REP01494 Question Ref: H2

3112/3111/1100/1044/31131336/21323114/1165/21562032/2091/1004All sites would add an extra between 7000 and 14000 people into an area which would not be able to support them.

Name: Carol Chapman

Representor No: PRS04021

Representation ID: REP00608 Question Ref: H2

Leeds LDF site 3373A. Objections.1.Character of area. Development on the scale envisaged, particularly when combined with other development sites, does not "respect the character and objectives of local communities"1670 proposed dwellings in the green sites in Tingley & Ardsley would seriously threaten the semi rural nature of the area .2.Damage to Haigh Wood .Site includes part of a Tree Preservation Order area. Development of this area will Impact on the pretty secluded valley. There will be a threat to a wide variety of wild life present in the valley.3.Inadequacy of access roads. Roads linked to the proposed development site are not suitable to take the expected increase in traffic .This could lead to a threat to children's safety especially when children are going to & coming home from the nearby Westerton Primary school when the area already gets very congested.4. School capacities. The local primary and secondary schools (Westerton ,Hill Top , Blackgates and Woodkirk Academy are already over subscribed and do not have the potential to be extended further.5. Other community facilities. Doctors ,Dentists ,health centres & leisure facilities in the area would be overstretched. 6. Building costs. Parts of 3373A have serious levels problems and look undevelopable. There was extensive mining in the area in the past & old bell pits have already been discovered which need to be dealt with.7.Lee Fair fields would be built on.This historic fair would need to be relocated and an alternative site would be needed. 8. AgricultureGood quality farmland growing a variety of crops will be lost. Site 1336.objectionsThe above objections excluding points 2 and 7

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1336

Housing

Westerton Road (land at), West Ardsley

Name: Pauline Hick

Representor No: PRS04104

Representation ID: REP01101 Question Ref: H2

I disagree with all the proposalsSite3112/3111/1100/1044/3113Site 1336/2132Site3114/1165/2156Site 2032/2091/1004Most of the above sites are situated in what are now farmed fields, which add character to the area, and are a major factor in attracting residents to the area. If these green spaces are eroded by development, the present schools will be insufficient, also other necessary services will struggle to maintain the high quality that we have at present. The proposed site between Barrowby Lane and Wakefield Road is not at present on mains sewerage (indeed many properties which already exist on Barrowby lane are not serviced by sewers), and as things stand the area easily floods, if the proposal goes forward this will surely make matters worse, as the surrounding land at present does retain some of the moisture. Another major factor to be considered is the increased traffic in the area, at present we have good rail and bus links into the city, however car parking at the station is already limiting to the number of commuters from the area, and the road network into the city struggles at peak periods. I understand that the present Traveller site at Cottingley Springs can be extended, this is obviously a better solution than creating another site on Wakefield Road, it would enable the families to stay together rather than separating them. In conclusion, I am totally against these proposals, and would like the council to reconsider their plans.

Name: Sarah Moorby

Representor No: PRS04111

Representation ID: REP01230 Question Ref: H2

3112/3111/1100/1044/3113 Wakefield Road: This is a busy road and introducing the 3500 houses onto this road will significantly grid lock Garforth at peak times. The additional housing will increase flooding which is already experienced at the roundabout on Selby road. The provision of school places and the Medical centres will be over subscribed, which they already are. Impact on wildlife.3114/1165/2156 Barwick Road: this is a small road with railway bridge and will increase traffic right on the top of Garforth Main Street. The provision of school places and the healthcare centres will be over subscribed, which they already are. Impact on wildlife.1336/2132 Selby Road: This is some distance out of Garforth itself and will need its own amenities and public services. Adequate surface water provision will need to be adopted to prevent flooding further down the hill in Garforth. Would a suitable footpath be built to access Garforth from this site. Impact on wildlife. This development may increase further developments in the future to close the gap to garforth.

Name: Wendy Astin

Representor No: PRS04260

Representation ID: REP01421 Question Ref: H2

3112/3111/11003113, 1336/2132, 3114/1165/2156 2032/2091/1004 All these areas would over populate the area with too many people and too much traffic. The schools could not cope with the amount of children, the doctors could not cope.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1336

Housing

Westerton Road (land at), West Ardsley

Name: Samantha Halls

Representor No: PRS04583

Representation ID: REP00646 Question Ref: H1

1. Local character and identity Development of site would be contrary to the following sections of the Council's policy SP1 in the Core Strategy: - Site 3373A, with its estimated capacity of 130 dwellings, does not have regard to the size, function and sustainability of West Ardsley. SP1 (iii) states: "For development to respect and enhance the local character and identity of places and neighbourhoods". The local character and identity of West Ardsley would be seriously threatened by 3373A, especially when combined with sites 3373C and 1336, and would make its component areas of Upper Green, Haigh Moor and Hill Top barely distinguishable from each other. My view accords with three decision letters from the Planning Inspectorate which were used in the Council's own evidence to the Unitary Development Plan public inquiry in 1995. In paragraph 39 of his report on Morley Local Plan, the inspector considered the planned development at Haigh Wood (site WA2H) would have a "very serious impact upon the character and environment of West Ardsley". He concluded paragraph 10: "In the past, development in the Morley area would appear to have been sporadic and opportunist, placing smaller settlements at risk and tending towards the creation of amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the length of the A650 Bradford to Wakefield road. In my view, the further diffusion of the existing loosely-knit settlement pattern should, as far as possible, be resisted." Considering appeals in 1986 on 81/23/00212 and 81/23/00213 (broadly the same area as LDF sites 3373A/B/C and 1336) the inspector said "It would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This was endorsed in the Secretary of State's decision letter. In 1994, a third inspector dismissed an appeal to develop land at Arthington Close near the edge of Haigh Wood because it would "unacceptably erode the fringe of this rural area and lead to pressure for further encroachment of residential development, particularly in the fields to the west...". Although some years ago these decisions, the character and environment of the area are still semi-rural and just as delicate. When cogent arguments have been repeatedly made against development of the 3373 areas by the Secretary of State, by three planning inspectors and by Leeds Council itself (in evidence to the UDP inquiry), there can be no justification for sites 3373A, 3373C and 1336 being pursued for residential development in the LDF. They should instead be reclassified as "red" and withdrawn from consideration for development when producing the next stage of the plan. 2. Damage to Haigh Wood and Baghill beck valley - Development of this site would be contrary to the Council's policy P12 in the Core Strategy:

Representation ID: REP00646 Question Ref: H2

I DISAGREE WITH SITES 3373A, 3373C and 1336 3. Fairness The Core Strategy seeks to be "fair". The word is used in paragraph 1.2 and again in 1.14. Yet the proposed green housing sites when taken together would definitely not be fair to West Ardsley and Tingley. No justification has been given as to why there is such a concentration here, nor any evidence of local need. Indeed, paragraph 4.6.14 states that "The SHMA 2011 was not able to identify any geographically specific need for new housing based on population growth." The sites seem to have been assessed individually rather than their cumulative impact. This impact is potentially greater when considered alongside Kirklees proposals for Chidswell 4. Highway access - The Upper Green culs-de-sac are not suitable to serve up to 130 more houses. They would become much less safe for children to play in and already severe dangers at school times would be exacerbated. 5. Schools - already full and difficult to expand further. 6. Agricultural - land good quality agricultural land would be lost. 7. Viability - costs from: a. parts of 3373A have serious levels problems and look undevelopable; b. bell pits known to exist in the area from former mining; c. elimination of Japanese Knotweed.

Name: Richard Thompson

Representor No: PRS04785

Representation ID: REP01145 Question Ref: H2

1228,1229,3112,3111,1100,1044,3113,1336,2132,3114,1165,2156,2032,2091,1004 (garforth). 1232 makins farm land seems much more suitable for several reasons. Accessibility from m1 etc rather than through garforth. Drainage. Flooding is an issue in some areas of garforth already additional housing will worsen this. Local services. School, doctors and the police will face greater demands.

Name: Malcolm Taylor

Representor No: PRS04834

Representation ID: REP01250 Question Ref: H2

Site ref 1336/2132 Selby Road My house borders Selby Road near to Ninelands Lane. Very heavy traffic including many HGV's pass along Selby Road past my house heading for the A1 and for access into Garforth via Ninelands Lane. Some years ago a new road was planned to by pass the length of Selby Road from the junction of Selby Road/ Wakefield Road to the Micklefield roundabout. It was deemed essential in view of the heavy traffic passing alongside a residential area and plans were available to view at a local hotel. The new road was to run more or less parallel to Selby Road but about half a mile south of Selby Road. It did not come to fruition due to financial restraints at that time, not because of any objections. Building more houses in this area will increase already intolerable traffic levels in an area already identified as suffering from traffic problems with an increase of noise/ dirt/pollution levels for all residents in this area. What was accepted those years ago should stand today, not exacerbating the situation!!

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1336

Housing

Westerton Road (land at), West Ardsley

Name: Andrea Heibel

Representor No: PRS04839

Representation ID: REP00878 Question Ref: G1

Site 3373A objection. The local character and identity of West Ardsley would be seriously threatened by 3373A, especially when combined with sites 3373C and 1336, and would make its component areas of Upper Green, Haigh Moor and Hill Top barely distinguishable from each other. My view accords with three decision letters from the Planning Inspectorate which were used in the Council's own evidence to the Unitary Development Plan public inquiry in 1995. In paragraph 39 of his report on the Morley Local Plan, the inspector considered that the planned development at Haigh Wood (site WA2H) would have a "very serious impact upon the character and environment of West Ardsley". "In the past, development in the Morley area would appear to have been sporadic and opportunist, placing the identity of the smaller settlements at risk and tending towards the creation of amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the length of the A650 Bradford to Wakefield road. In my view, the further diffusion of the existing loosely-knit settlement pattern should, as far as possible, be resisted." In 1994, another inspector dismissed an appeal to develop land at Arthington Close near the edge of Haigh Wood because it would "unacceptably erode the fringe of this rural area and would lead to pressure for further encroachment of residential development, most particularly in the fields to the west...".

Name: Emma Winter

Representor No: PRS04943

Representation ID: REP05578 Question Ref: H4

I strongly object to all the above developments proposed in Garforth for the following reasons

1. Increased risk of flooding in area's that already flood due to inadequate sewage and surface drainage facilities
2. Hugely increased traffic congestion in general as well as grid lock at peak times at such areas as Garforth Bridge, Townend, Lidgett Lane/Selby Road junction
3. Breaking the natural boundary of the village leaving it setting a precedent for more over development of Green Belt land by greedy developers
4. Demand for school places for Primary and Academy places would be way beyond capacity without any new development to this infrastructure
5. Excessive increase and high demand on doctors, dentists, police, fire, without increase in services
6. No requirement for a travellers site, as extension to Cottingley Springs provides sufficient needs!
7. Horrendous impact on habitat of natural wildlife that will be irreversible

Further to these points of objection, I understand and appreciate that some land has to be allocated for development. Therefore I would suggest that the land ref site 1232 will accommodate things in a better way.

1. Access can be from Ridge Road giving access to A63. A642 and A1/M1 link road without going through the heart of our village causing chaos.
2. No flooding impact as new infrastructure would need to be developed.
3. Space to accommodate green areas within development
4. Extra provision of dentists, doctors etc could also be provided in this area

Ultimately I would prefer the continual over development of the Garforth area are not to happen at all and from experience I doubt this will happen as planners do not appear to consider local opinions. However I would prefer this alternative compromise to be the way forward if development is forced in the area!

Name: Diane Thorne

Representor No: PRS05035

Representation ID: REP05601 Question Ref: H4

Traffic chaos on Selby Road site near school academy, not enough school places at present for the demand. Without DOUBLING DEMAND 3 more academies would be needed.

There has been more than 5 large housing development sites in Garforth in the last 6 years, We just can't keep building without thinking.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1336

Housing

Westerton Road (land at), West Ardsley

Name: Samantha Halls

Representor No: PRS05085

Representation ID: REP05653 Question Ref: H1

Site 3373A. Objections

1. Local character and identity

Development of this site would be contrary to the following sections of the Council's policy SP1 in the Core Strategy:

1. SP1 (i) states: "Smaller Settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlement's size, function and sustainability."

Site 3373A, with its estimated capacity of 130 dwellings, does not have regard to the size, function and sustainability of West Ardsley.

SP1 (iii) states: "For development to respect and enhance the local character and identity of places and neighbourhoods". The local character and identity of West Ardsley would be seriously threatened by 3373A, especially when combined with sites 3373C and 1336, and would make its component areas of Upper Green, Haigh Moor and Hill Top barely distinguishable from each other.

My view accords with three decision letters from the Planning Inspectorate which were used in the Council's own evidence to the Unitary Development Plan public inquiry in 1995. In paragraph 39 of his report on the Morley Local Plan, the inspector considered that the planned development at Haigh Wood (site WA2H) would have a "very serious impact upon the character and environment of West Ardsley". He concluded in paragraph 10: "In the past, development in the Morley area would appear to have been sporadic and opportunist, placing the identity of the smaller settlements at risk and tending towards the creation of amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the length of the A650 Bradford to Wakefield road. In my view, the further diffusion of the existing loosely-knit settlement pattern should, as far as possible, be resisted." Considering appeals in 1986 on 81/23/00212 and 81/23/00213 (broadly the same area as LDF sites 3373A/B/C and 1336) the inspector said "It would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This was endorsed in the Secretary of State's decision letter.

In 1994, a third inspector dismissed an appeal to develop land at Arthington Close near the the edge of Haigh Wood because it would "unacceptably erode the fringe of this rural area and would lead to pressure for further encroachment of residential development, most particularly in the fields to the west..."

Although some years have passed since these decisions, the character and environment of the area are still semi-rural and just as delicate. When cogent arguments have been repeatedly made against development of the 3373 areas by the Secretary of State, by three planning inspectors and by Leeds Council itself (in evidence to the UDP inquiry), there can be no justification for sites 3373A, 3373C and 1336 being pursued for residential development in the LDF. They should instead be reclassified as "red" and withdrawn from consideration for development when producing the next stage of the plan.

2. Damage to Haigh Wood and Baghill beck valley

Development of this site would be contrary to the Council's policy P12 in the Core Strategy:

"The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes, including their historical and cultural significance, will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness through stewardship and the planning process." The secluded Haigh Wood valley comprises the central portion of site 3373A, including part of the wood covered by a Tree Preservation Order. Residential development would prejudice the objectives underlining this policy as set out in paragraphs 5.3.46 to 5.3.48 of the Core Strategy including: "The Council seeks to protect and enhance the varied landscapes of Leeds and the assets they contain, from valued local trees, the countryside to nationally designated landscape, fauna and flora".

This view was endorsed by three planning inspectors and again in the Council's evidence, given by Mr G B Andrews, at the UDP inquiry. In his paragraph 4.3.6, Mr Andrews stated: I refer to the conclusions reached by the inspectors at the two subsequent appeal cases in 1985 and 1994. In each case it is acknowledged that the Haigh Wood area is of value as an area of attractive open farmland with a rural character and provides an important amenity in the local area". Even the Council's own assessment for the LDF states that the site is: "Not supported (RED). This site includes Haigh Wood and Baghill Beck Local Nature Area which fall under UK Biological Action Plan priority habitats - a mixture of woodland, scrub and grassland habitats alongside Baghill Beck. There are a number of wide hedgerow/woodland belts throughout the site that provide a valuable habitat. Water vole has been recorded on the Hey Beck. The Baghill Beck flows into this water course and could support this species. Bats to consider."

3. Fairness

The Core Strategy seeks to be "fair". The word is used in paragraph 1.2 and again in 1.14. Yet the proposed green housing sites when taken together would definitely not be fair to West Ardsley and Tingley. No justification has been given as to why there is such a concentration here, nor any evidence of local need. Indeed, paragraph 4.6.14 states that "The SHMA 2011 was not able to identify any geographically specific need for new housing based on population growth." The sites seem to have been assessed individually rather than their cumulative impact. This impact is potentially very much greater when considered alongside Kirklees Council's proposals for the Chidswell area.

4. Highway access

The Upper Green culs-de-sac are not suitable to serve up to 130 more houses. They would become much less safe for children to play in and the already severe dangers at school times would be exacerbated.

5. Schools

Primary and secondary schools already full and difficult to expand further.

6. Agricultural land

Good quality agricultural land would be lost.

7. Viability

Extra costs from: a. parts of 3373A have serious levels problems and look undevelopable; b. bell pits known to exist in the area from former mining; c. elimination of Japanese Knotweed.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1336

Housing

Westerton Road (land at), West Ardsley

Name: Lynsey Morris

Representor No: PRS05111

Representation ID: REP05692 Question Ref: H1

Hi,

I would like to object against the planning proposals for the following sites on Map 33 (off Westerton Road)

1336

3373B

3373A

1330B

33732

3365

3373C

3456A

3456B

1258

I suggest that these should all be changed to RED due to the following reasons:

Too much traffic already so roads will be extremely busy right outside my front door. I have young children and will be scared for their safety.

Services such as Doctors surgery's, dentists, local hospitals, schools, supermarkets already too busy so won't be able to cope

Less water will be absorbed into the ground resulting in more flooding in our gardens.

This is currently already happening in several houses on Westerton Road including mine.

There are bats, foxes, owls, frogs, newts and many birds living in the area especially on sites 1336, 3373A, 3373B, 3373C. Should these not be protected?

House prices for homeowners in the area already will decrease.

We moved to the area because of the greenery and our view will be spoilt.

The sewerage system in place on Westerton Road recently failed causing waste from the sewers to overflow into nearby houses. This was due to the recent housing developments that have recently been built nearby so the sewerage system was unable to cope. This could very likely happen again.

Name: D, M, S Johnson And Kenny

Representor No: PRS05119

Representation ID: REP05702 Question Ref: General comment

Firstly I would like to express my disappointment and embarrassment towards the councils plans for the proposed plans listed below. I understand the reason behind the lack of communication with the residents in the area may be beneficial to the local council and certain government groups. It obviously cuts down on man hours and paperwork.

I would like to object against the planning proposals for the following sites on Map 33 (off Westerton Road)

1336

3373B

3373A

1330B

33732

3365

3373C

3456A

3456B

1258

The infrastructure in this area will struggle to cope with the demands of the services required.

The area is attracting wildlife not seen in built up areas. It seems a shame to disregard the wildlife issue I'm sure if a full environmental survey of the area was to be carried out this would scupper the planning permission. But again that would be an extra cost to the council which would have an impact at year end when the books are balanced.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1336

Housing

Westerton Road (land at), West Ardsley

Name: Ian Morris

Representor No: PRS05121

Representation ID: REP05700 Question Ref: H1

Firstly I would like to express my disappointment and embarrassment towards the councils plans for the proposed plans listed below. I understand the reason behind the lack of communication with the residents in the area may be beneficial to the local council and certain government groups. It obviously cuts down on man hours and paperwork.

I would like to object against the planning proposals for the following sites on Map 33 (off Westerton Road)

1336
3373B
3373A
1330B
33732
3365
3373C
3456A
3456B
1258

The infrastructure in this area will struggle to cope with the demands of the services required.

The area is attracting wildlife not seen in built up areas. It seems a shame to disregard the wildlife issue I'm sure if a full environmental survey of the area was to be carried out this would scupper the planning permission. But again that would be an extra cost to the council which would have an impact at year end when the books are balanced.

Name: Brian Judge

Representor No: PRS05411

Representation ID: REP06013 Question Ref: H1

1336 – Suggested Change GREEN to RED

Reason for change - Adding traffic problems on Westerton Road, cars blocking access to roads already when parked up at school times. Residents are unable to go about their business in not having access to their properties because of parked cars.

Other remarks - What are the councils forward plans if any for improving this problem i.e. solving rather than adding to it? School would appear to be overcrowded now with lack of access to GP practises. Very surprising that any accident as not occurred at school times already. 1336 –

Suggested Change GREEN to RED

Reason for change - Adding traffic problems on Westerton Road, cars blocking access to roads already when parked up at school times. Residents are unable to go about their business in not having access to their properties because of parked cars.

Other remarks - What are the councils forward plans if any for improving this problem i.e. solving rather than adding to it? School would appear to be overcrowded now with lack of access to GP practises. Very surprising that any accident as not occurred at school times already.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1336

Housing

Westerton Road (land at), West Ardsley

Name: A Jackson

Representor No: PRS05857

Representation ID: REP06573 Question Ref: H1

I write to express my concerns and objections to the proposed development of the above.

Garforth is already heavily populated with increased traffic on the existing local streets, roads and has increasing congestion on the main roads serving Garforth. Most properties seem to own or on average own and park 2 or more cars causing problems with parking as well as congestion with regard to traffic flow.

There are issues with regard to congestion/grid lock, drainage and flooding, particularly at the Old George Roundabout (Miller and Carter Restaurant by the Holiday Inn) and at the junction of Wakefield Road/(top)Main Street. The traffic light system would need revision at the Wakefield Road/(top) Main Street junction to effectively manage the increased traffic flow at the junction of 4 busy arterial roads.

Smaller, less busy streets would become cut-through routes to avoid congested routes which would put the public, children and vulnerable adults at risk of injury through an increase in road traffic accidents. Funds need to be allocated and used to provide appropriate safe recreational indoor and outdoor facilities in Garforth to encourage young people of all ages to be fit and active.

Access to the shopping facilities on Garforth Main Street is interrupted by the volume of traffic parked road side around Main Street, particularly on Barleyhill Road and Church Lane, deeming the roads accessible by single file traffic only. There is insufficient parking available in Garforth for the proposed development given that in reality most people use their vehicles for park and ride at the railway stations and when shopping/attending appointments/school&education/childcare facilities.

It is valuable to the community of Garforth to maintain and encourage the wildlife, plants, vegetation and insects in the green areas of the town. We need to protect the important effect that nature plays in their growth and in our gardens, and to preserve their natural habitats.

The proposed development will further put strain on the local shops, schools, nurseries, child care facilities, transport (bus/train services) and medical (doctors surgeries/medical centres) and fire/police services who already seem to work to capacity.

.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1336

Housing

Westerton Road (land at), West Ardsley

Name: Helen Falkingham

Representor No: PRS06065

Representation ID: REP06913 Question Ref: H1

I am writing in my capacity as a resident of Garforth to put my objections to the building on the Greenfield site to west of Wakefield Road in Garforth (coded 1100, 1044, 3113, 3111, and 3112)

Wakefield Road acts as a natural boundary to Garforth, so no houses should be built on that side of the road. If they are, it may set a precedent for further building, and eventually we will be linked to Crossgates and therefore Leeds itself.

Wakefield Road, and it's junctions at Town End and Garforth Bridge are already congested, and additional traffic created from this development could easily lead to total gridlock at any time of the day.

The infrastructure of drainage at that side of Garforth is already fairly fragile, the land, and the houses on the other side of Wakefield Road are already prone to flooding so adding more houses, and concrete driveways will remove drain away, leading to more flood threats. Garforth Bridge, a major route in and out of Garforth has been closed in the past by flooding and this may occur more often if there is no land for water to soak into. The number of families with children moving into the area will impact on the schools, which are near to capacity already, and this would also contribute to traffic congestion when they are shipped out to other areas for school. There would also be increased demand on other services within Garforth, such as doctors and dentists and put increased pressure on policing and fire services, which have been cut back to bare minimums.

Other areas pinpointed for development such as the south side of Selby road (coded 1336 and 3132) are also not suitable for development as they will cause severe congestion on Selby Road, which already backs up to Ninelands Lane on weekdays. Also the road is not safe for traffic exiting onto Selby Road, and adding further junctions will just make things worse.

Another site proposed is behind Town End (coded 3114, 1165, and 2156). This is not suitable as it can only be accessed under a narrow railway bridge, which is already a nightmare to negotiate. The increased volume of traffic that would arise because of this development would totally block this area and add to the already very congested Town End junction. The only other exit from Garforth would be along a country road and through Barwick in Elmet and Scholes.

I am not sure that the development coded 1232, 1244, and 3110 should go ahead. This would be such a big development as to almost double the size of Garforth, and is large enough to be a community in its own right. This would require schools, health services, policing and other services to be provided. Should such a community be built so close to an existing one that it becomes part of the existing community? At the moment this area is used for farming, so what happens to the food production when this goes? I do accept however that building on this site will solve some of the traffic headaches that are a major concern with other developments in Garforth itself.

I cannot understand why it is necessary to build houses on land which has never been used for building before when there are places in Leeds which have been, and look such eye sores, where buildings have been demolished and the land left to 'rot'. I believe these areas and areas where houses have been abandoned and boarded up should be redeveloped first, before using farmland and countryside habitat.

[x]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1336

Housing

Westerton Road (land at), West Ardsley

Name: West Ardsley Consortium

Representor No: PRS06168

Representation ID: REP07292 Question Ref: H7

Dear Madam

Allocations Issues and Options Document - Sites 536 (Nook Farm) , 1330 B (Adjacent to Judes Pond), 1336 (Westerton Road, and 3373 A, B and C (Haigh Wood)

We act on behalf of the West Ardsley Consortium that has made formal comments to the Leeds Site Allocations Issues and Options documents. We enclose a copy of the Document submitted with the formal response for your information.

Our clients are interested in sites 536 (Nook Farm) , 1330 B (Adjacent to Judes Pond), 1336 (Westerton Road, and 3373 A, B and C (Haigh Wood) and have previously made representations for the sites to be allocated, along with a substantial area of ecologically maintained open space centred around the Haigh Wood area.

Having seen the draft proposals our clients are supportive in principle of the Councils approach to identifying a large portion of the land promoted by them for residential development. The areas identified as "Green" (for development) in the Issues and Options document at Haigh Wood amount to 16.83 Ha of land with a suggested dwelling capacity of over 400 units (at a reasonably low 25/Ha). The areas identified as "Red" (felt to be not suitable for development) amount to 17.5 Ha. This sets an approach of slightly over half the land being protected from development.

We note that the site known as Nook Farm (536) is an existing UDPR commitment and has no policy designation that has or would suggest anything other than its suitability for residential development. That site also has (contrary to the suggestion in the Issues and Options document) an extant planning permission. The details of this are set out in our formal representations.

Having reviewed the indicative boundaries suggested between the "Green" and "Red" sites in the Issues and Options document and undertaken a detailed assessment against trees, topography, the LNA of Haigh Wood and the stream running through it, whilst acknowledging the need for an uninterrupted green corridor separating the north west and south east areas of land, our clients are firmly of the view that the Councils preliminary work does not produce appropriate boundaries between development allocations and non development allocations. For example as figure 3 in the attached document shows land is identified by the Council for development in site 3373A that includes part of the LNA, the trees of Haigh Wood and the stream running through it, whilst seeking to protect from development land to the south east which has none of those considerations applying to it.

Utilising the work already done on ecology, trees and hedges, landscape and topography, our Clients have carefully considered the Councils objectives and aspirations from the comments in the tables and pro formas associated with the Issues and Options document. They have produced a revised masterplan and from that been able to identify appropriate development and allocation boundaries. These maintain a broad green corridor through the valley, protecting ecological interests, trees and the stream as well as views and the "open feel" of the valley itself. In particular this has not only widened the broad swathe of green between the development areas, compared to the earlier 2012 masterplan, but removed any road connections across the valley.

The resultant masterplan has been informed by all the Consortium team's professional disciplines and the changed highways connections fully evaluated to ensure they work appropriately.

The outcome is that of the area in the UDPR that is identified as NI 1 (some 36.14 Ha) only 40% is now proposed for development. The suggested allocations (boundaries shown in red on Figure 6 of the attached document include (so that the allocations are not excessively subdivided) substantial green corridors and strategic planting, amounting to some 3.24Ha. These run along the existing and proposed pedestrian and bridleway access corridors to the valley and the Wood. The suggested total area of the allocations (including the 3.24 Ha of undeveloped green space) is under half of the current NI1 land at 17.66 Ha. We believe this provides the right balance of development and protection of the wider site.

We note that the areas identified as "Green" in the Issues and Options document in this Outer South West area are insufficient by some margin (1,432) to meet the Core Strategy suggested proportion of housing for the area, even taking into account (and not questioning) the amount of development to come forward from permissions and existing allocations. There should be no doubt that all "Green" sites should therefore go forward for allocation. Indeed more will need to be found from "Amber" or even "Red" sites to provide sufficient land. In addition, there are proportionately far fewer "Green" sites (compared to "Amber") in East and West Ardsley than there are in Morley or the rest of the Outer South West.

The site at Haigh Wood with its non greenbelt status and accessibility and sustainability credentials provides a very good location for development and the provision of material environmental benefits through protection, increased access and environmental management of the Wood itself. As there have to be exceptional circumstances to take land out of the greenbelt, there must correspondingly be exceptional circumstances not to develop at Haigh Wood ahead of greenbelt land.

For all of these reasons our clients, look forward to working with the Council to bring forward development in line with the attached revised masterplan, which we believe fully addresses all comments made in the Issues and Options document and the related proformas about the land at Haigh Wood.

Yours faithfully

[x]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1336

Housing

Westerton Road (land at), West Ardsley

Name: Sylvia Marshall

Representor No: PRS06356

Representation ID: REP07338 Question Ref: H1

1336

We like to shop in Garforth but parking facilities are very low and once again medical appointments are stretched to the limit. The schools are full to the brim now. Are they going to provide more schools and medical facilities?

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 1 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if these sites would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. Significant developer contributions will be required at these sites to improve the public transport to meet the council LDF accessibility policies; particularly in the larger sites should these be brought forward for development. These include SHLAA ref: 2062, 1032, 1046, 1017 & 1055.

Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small sites low capacity are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

The table also includes accessibility assessments results to access other services and facilities within acceptable journey times on public transport.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H1

Disagree with Council's green assessment, think the site should be red

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H1

Site 1336 - Green Belt and important in maintaining open views over Ardsley Reservoir and the South Pennines. Unlike 1258, has no firm southern boundary. Green to red.

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H1

Site 1336 - Green Belt and important in maintaining open views over Ardsley Reservoir and the South Pennines. Unlike 1258, has no firm southern boundary. Green to red.

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H1

Disagree with Council's green assessment, think the site should be red

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1336

Housing

Westerton Road (land at), West Ardsley

Name: Joanne Young

Representor No: PRS07143

Representation ID: REP08297 Question Ref: H1

Reason for change from Green to Red - Additional information — Site 1336 Map.33

1. Inadequacy of access roads.

a. Access to the site would have to be either on to the main Westerton Road or by extending the current Upper Green Drive through site 3373A Map.33.

i If an entry via site 1336 was considered I would question the viability regards safety of the said junction as it would need to join Westerton road straight after the bend when approaching towards Westerton School.

ii. If the entry was via extending Upper Green Drive I would then propose that this is a potential threat to children's safety by increasing the volume of traffic that would enter the existing development via the single entry directly opposite Westerton School which is already very congested at school opening and closing times.

iii. The width of the current developments roads on Upper Green would also be questionable as to whether they would be safe with a higher volume of traffic as currently cars can not pass comfortably without taking evasive action.

2. School Capacities

a. Westerton — the Head of Westerton has already confirmed in writing that the school is already at maximum capacity moving into the next several years.

b. Blackgates — This school has already been enlarged and again the Head has confirmed that they are also at maximum capacity once again.

c. Woodkirk — Once again it is my belief that the Head of Woodkirk is of the opinion that the school is at capacity therefore with the school being fed by Westerton and Blackgates (amongst others) how would they possibly cope with additional children in the area?

3. Other Community Facilities

a. Would other facilities such as doctors and dentists etc be overstretched by this increased population? Leigh View Medical practice has already been recently redeveloped therefore I would certainly question the potential risk with increase local population.

4. Character of the Area

a. With a development on the scale envisaged for site 1336, particularly when combined with other existing developed sites in my opinion it does not "respect the character and objectives of the local communities" as quoted in paragraph 8.4 of the Plan Overview.

b. Have all of the brown belt sites been considered for their viability. Although brown belt sites tend to be more expensive to develop these must be higher on the development priority list to assist their regeneration and preserve green belts to maintain the character of the local areas.

c.

5. Are the wards in partnership with the potential proposals?

a. Site 1336 and most but not all of 3373A are in Ardsley and Robin Hood ward however the remainder of 3373A and most of the residents who would be effected live in the Morley South ward.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1336

Housing

Westerton Road (land at), West Ardsley

Name: Hilary Cooper

Representor No: PRS07144

Representation ID: REP08298 Question Ref: H1

Reason for change from Green to Red - Additional Information — Site 1336Tingley Map 33

1. Inadequacy of access roads.

a. Access to the site would have to be either on to the main Westerton Road or by extending the current Upper Green Drive through site 3373A Map33.

i. If an entry via site 1336 was considered I would question the viability regards safety of the said junction as it would need to join Westerton road straight after the bend when approaching towards Westerton School.

ii. If the entry was via extending Upper Green Drive I would then propose that this is a potential threat to children's safety by increasing the volume of traffic that would enter the existing development via the single entry directly opposite Westerton School which is already heavily congested at school opening and closing times.

iii. The width of the current developments roads on Upper Green would also be questionable as to whether they would be safe with a higher volume of traffic as currently cars can not pass comfortably without taking avoiding action.

2. School Capacities

a. Westerton — the Head of Westerton has already confirmed in writing that the school is already at maximum capacity moving into the next several years.

b. Blackgates — This school has already been enlarged and again the Head has confirmed that they are also at maximum capacity once again.

c. Woodkirk — Once again it is my belief that the Head of Woodkirk is of the opinion that the school is at capacity therefore with the school being fed by Westerton and Blackgates (amongst others) how would they possibly cope with additional children in the area?

3. Other Community Facilities

a. Would other facilities such as doctors and dentists etc be overstretched by this increased population? Leigh View Medical practice has already been recently redeveloped therefore I would certainly question the potential risk with increase local population.

4. Character of the Area

a. With a development on the scale envisaged for site 1336, particularly when combined with other existing developed sites in my opinion it does not "respect the character and objectives of the local communities" as quoted in paragraph 8.4 of the Plan Overview.

b. Have all of the brown belt sites been considered for their viability. Although brown belt sites tend to be more expensive to develop these must be higher on the development priority list to assist their regeneration and preserve green belts to maintain the character of the local areas.

c.

5. Are the wards in partnership with the potential proposals?

a. Site 1336 and most but not all of 3373A are in Ardsley and Robin Hood ward however the remainder of 3373A and most of the residents who would be effected live in the Morley South ward.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1344

Housing

Westfield Farm, Drighlington BD11

Name: L. A Mitchell

Representor No: PRS00327

Representation ID: REP02264 Question Ref: H1

3003 All sites in Drighlington should be red sites. These are all green belt and should remain as such, there will be no land left in the area. We will be joined to Leeds. Drighlington is no longer a village, there is no infrastructure, roads jammed with traffic, doctors full, no shops, poor sewerage system throughout the village. Roads already full. No schools. We do not want to be an extension of Leeds. The sites are green belt and need to be left as such, to maintain the character of Drighlington. We do not have the infrastructure for any more people or buildings. We had two schools, one has now closed, already the new school has had an extension - so where will all the children go? Why not refurbish the disused mill on Whitehall Road for housing instead of using green field sites?

Name: Doreen Goor

Representor No: PRS00329

Representation ID: REP02274 Question Ref: H1

Green to red. 333/1077/1344/3003 - not enough sewer works to cope with so many houses.

Name: M. J Cousin

Representor No: PRS00330

Representation ID: REP02275 Question Ref: H1

333, 1077, 1344, 3003, 533 - Green to red. The schools are full as are the dentists and health. Not enough shops, services or sewerage systems.

Name: P And K. H Copley

Representor No: PRS00331

Representation ID: REP02276 Question Ref: H1

Green to red. 333/1077/1344/3003. Infrastructure in village is not suitable. Not enough shops, sewers, services in general, school, nursery's.

Name: J Glazzard

Representor No: PRS00332

Representation ID: REP02277 Question Ref: H1

Green to red. 333/1077/1344/3003 All sites in Drighlington green to red. Please look at the brownfield sites first.

Name: A Thornton

Representor No: PRS00524

Representation ID: REP02474 Question Ref: H1

1344 - Change from Green to Red - As there are in my opinion sufficient brown field sites across Leeds to accommodate the site capacity.

Name: Elaine Thorton

Representor No: PRS00584

Representation ID: REP02542 Question Ref: H1

1344 - Land at Westfield Farm Drighlington. Green to Red as there are in our opinion sufficient brown field sites across Leeds to accommodate the site capacity.

Name: Arthur Thornton

Representor No: PRS02730

Representation ID: REP05188 Question Ref: H1

Land at Westfield Farm Drighlington. Green to Red as there are in our opinion sufficient brown field sites across Leeds to accommodate the site capacity.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1344

Housing

Westfield Farm, Drighlington BD11

Name: Richard Marshall

Representor No: PRS03170

Representation ID: REP01024 Question Ref: H5

1079, 1072, 1077, 1143B, 1143D, 1171B, 1200A, 1258, 1284a, 1285, 1344, 2098a, 3365, 3456A.2098C, 2105, 2155, 3000, 3056.3064, 3078A, 4004, and 4029. As previously stated the amber sites that are greenbelt land should not be considered for development. Site 1032 is designated as a protected area of search this land has been retained along the edge of the existing settlement pending more suitable sites being found in the longer term this site should only be developed as a last resort.

Representation ID: REP01024 Question Ref: H2

1079, 1072, 1077, 1143B, 1143D, 1171B, 1200A, 1258, 1284a, 1285, 1344, 2098a, 3365, 3456A. All these sites are green belt sites , green belt land is there to stop urban sprawl and the destruction of the countryside that still remains in this area. If sites 1143B, 1143D, 1143F, 2155, 1274, 1032, and 2128 are built on East Ardsley West Ardsley and Tingley will just become one built up area hemmed in by the M62. Not all of these are greenbelt sites but if the development is allowed the basic principal of having greenbelt in this area will be completely wrecked!

Name: Neil Dawson

Representor No: PRS05884

Representation ID: REP06563 Question Ref: H1

Suggested sites from Green to Red;

1029
1072
1143B
1143D
1200A
1258
1344
3365
3373A
3373C
3456A

All of the above sites are in the current Green Belt with the exception of the 3373A and 3373C which are open land.

The other sites are all located within the existing Green Belt and any development would lead to increased urban sprawl between the various townships in the Outer South West, and lead to coalescence between communities.

Development of the Green Belt sites would also reduce the open green area between settlements and create encroachment into the countryside around Morley.

In addition there is insufficient road capacity in the area particularly the very busy single carriageway A650 from East Ardsley to Tingley. Even if there is no development of the above sites there is in the allocation plan over 1,200 additional new houses close to the A650 which will put additional strain on this busy road.

The Haigh Moor sites are part of a natural valley which is popular for recreational activities. The whole site is considered best treated as one, therefore if the largest part 3373B is not to be used for housing then the other parts of the site should be treated in a similar manner. This should be retained as open green space.

Site 1072 is in the Green Belt and although there are properties adjacent it is located near to the A653 and shares similar characteristics to site 3078B which is not considered suitable for development. A development at this site would set a precedent for incursion into the Green Belt between Leeds and Kirklees.

See rep for full details.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1344

Housing

Westfield Farm, Drighlington BD11

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 4 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' and 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network.

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network)

From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service frequency levels.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites - green sites are linked to this comment]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H1

Agree with green allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H1

Agree with green allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2036

Housing

Rod Mills Lane, High Street, Morley

Name: Brian Guy

Representor No: PRS00142

Representation ID: REP04659 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: Wenda P Whitehead

Representor No: PRS00312

Representation ID: REP04786 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: Janice Beever

Representor No: PRS00441

Representation ID: REP04791 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: P S Barrie

Representor No: PRS00915

Representation ID: REP04769 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Representation ID: REP04810 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Representation ID: REP04781 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: Lynne Paul

Representor No: PRS01169

Representation ID: REP04800 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: D Paul

Representor No: PRS01183

Representation ID: REP04793 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: B Stringer

Representor No: PRS01606

Representation ID: REP04797 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2036

Housing

Rod Mills Lane, High Street, Morley

Name: L.e Beever

Representor No: PRS01607

Representation ID: REP04804 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: J Cowie

Representor No: PRS02227

Representation ID: REP04768 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: Susan Holt

Representor No: PRS02289

Representation ID: REP04772 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: Dereck Holt

Representor No: PRS02311

Representation ID: REP04766 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: Jenni Davenport

Representor No: PRS02330

Representation ID: REP04770 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: Frank Raven

Representor No: PRS02339

Representation ID: REP04771 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: E Naylor

Representor No: PRS02363

Representation ID: REP04780 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: Kathleen Paver

Representor No: PRS02372

Representation ID: REP04774 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2036

Housing

Rod Mills Lane, High Street, Morley

Name: C Guy

Representor No: PRS02377

Representation ID: REP04767 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: C Clegg

Representor No: PRS02406

Representation ID: REP04663 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: Doreen Gill

Representor No: PRS02496

Representation ID: REP04755 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: D Naylor

Representor No: PRS02497

Representation ID: REP04773 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: A Paver

Representor No: PRS02498

Representation ID: REP04775 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: James Bowers

Representor No: PRS02500

Representation ID: REP04777 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: Alan Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02501

Representation ID: REP04778 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: Vivienne Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02502

Representation ID: REP04779 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2036

Housing

Rod Mills Lane, High Street, Morley

Name: Vivian Oxtoby

Representor No: PRS02504

Representation ID: REP04783 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: Beryl Hewitt

Representor No: PRS02506

Representation ID: REP04785 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: D A Clegg

Representor No: PRS02507

Representation ID: REP04788 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: Pauline Wood

Representor No: PRS02508

Representation ID: REP04790 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: Joyce Thompson

Representor No: PRS02510

Representation ID: REP04792 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: Patricia Aston

Representor No: PRS02513

Representation ID: REP04796 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: L. G Wilson

Representor No: PRS02515

Representation ID: REP04799 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: S Laurence

Representor No: PRS02517

Representation ID: REP04801 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2036

Housing

Rod Mills Lane, High Street, Morley

Name: C Graham

Representor No: PRS02518

Representation ID: REP04803 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: M Allsop

Representor No: PRS02520

Representation ID: REP04805 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: R Hartill

Representor No: PRS02521

Representation ID: REP04806 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: Edith Holmes

Representor No: PRS02522

Representation ID: REP04808 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: Harry Holmes

Representor No: PRS02524

Representation ID: REP04811 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: Ann Morse

Representor No: PRS02526

Representation ID: REP04813 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: L.r Morse

Representor No: PRS02527

Representation ID: REP04816 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: Michael Hartill

Representor No: PRS02556

Representation ID: REP04847 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2036

Housing

Rod Mills Lane, High Street, Morley

Name: Jim Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02561

Representation ID: REP04852 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: Helen Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02562

Representation ID: REP04855 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: Ronald Gill

Representor No: PRS02564

Representation ID: REP04858 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: A.w Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02565

Representation ID: REP04859 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: J Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02566

Representation ID: REP04860 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: Norman Dearden

Representor No: PRS02568

Representation ID: REP04857 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace proposed Green sites in the Outer South West area. 2036 Rods Mill Lane, Capacity 66, Ward Morley S. A brownfield site in the middle of a settlement.

Name: Ian Smith

Representor No: PRS06235

Representation ID: REP07425 Question Ref: H4

This site adjoins the boundary of the Morley Town Centre Conservation Area. There are also Grade 11 Listed Buildings to the west (Offices occupied by Rentokil). There is a requirement in the 1990 Act that "special regard" should be had to the desirability of preserving Listed Buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. Consequently, if allocated, any development proposals for this area would need to ensure that those elements which contribute to the significance of these assets are not harmed.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2036

Housing

Rod Mills Lane, High Street, Morley

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H4

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 4 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' and 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network.

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network)

From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service frequency levels.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites - amber sites are linked to this comment]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H4

Disagree with Council's amber assessment, think the site should be green

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H4

Site 2036 - Close to town centre; Listed Buildings and protected trees are constraints which shouldn't be insurmountable. Amber to green.

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H4

Disagree with Council's amber assessment, think the site should be green

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H4

Site 2036 - Close to town centre; Listed Buildings and protected trees are constraints which shouldn't be insurmountable. Amber to green.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2078

Housing

Gelderd Road (land to the south of), Wortley LS12

Name: Hoare

Representor No: PRS05410

Representation ID: REP06016 Question Ref: H4

2078 – Land to the south of Gelderd Road, Wortley

4.28 This site is located directly to the east of site 3056. The comments noted above also apply in this site. Recommendation – reclassify as 'red' due to the obvious lack of a defensible boundary and therefore its potentially damaging impact on the Green Belt.

Name: Neil Dawson

Representor No: PRS05884

Representation ID: REP06563 Question Ref: H4

The current number of sites required in the Outer South West is 7,200 and not withstanding my comments above on the overall numbers I would suggest the following changes to site allocations.

The total green and amber housing sites allocated in Outer South West is 9,653 whereas the plan is seeking 5,586 residential units. 1,614 housing units already have planning permission. There is therefore scope to increase the number of housing sites allocated as Red which are therefore not considered suitable for housing allocation.

There are two underlying reasons for revising the allocation of sites from Green and Amber to Red.

Firstly to protect the existing Green Belt around Morley and the Green Belt around smaller settlements in the Outer South West. In particular to restrict the sprawl of large built up areas and to prevent Morley and smaller settlements from merging to existing townships.

Secondly in my submission to the LDF in April 2012 I identified the Beeston Royds area in Outer South West as an area suitable for further significant housing development. This area is on the edge of the main urban area of Leeds. It has very good existing road links (the A61, A58 and the A6110) and it is close to the M621/M62.

There is a mixture of employment and residential use in the area and careful planning in the area should allow both employment and residential developments to take place for the duration of the plan.

Suggested sites to move from Amber to Green;

141
2078
3056
3386
4029

Site 141 is currently in employment use but is a brownfield site and as such should be considered for residential development ahead of other potential Greenfield sites.

The sites 3056, 2078, 4029 and 3386 are located in the Beeston Royds area in Farnley and Wortley ward and should be considered for residential development.

These sites could link with existing development in the area which is part of the main Leeds urban area. These developments will require a new road linking Gelderd Road and Whitehall Road but given the number of housing units this should be economically viable. The area would then have good access to the existing road network, at the Leeds Outer Ring Road and the M621/M62. It is close to retail facilities at Junction One, the White Rose Centre plus local shops in Lower Wortley. There is also potential for primary school development in the area if the total number of sites is expanded.

See rep for full details

Name: Liongate Developments Limited

Representor No: PRS06410

Representation ID: REP07389 Question Ref: H4

Site 2078 — Land north of Geldard Road. Wortley [to red]

This site is located directly to the east of site 3056. The comments noted above [for site 3056] also apply in this site.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2078

Housing

Gelderd Road (land to the south of), Wortley LS12

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H4

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Amber Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are be minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H4

Disagree with Council's amber assessment, think the site should be red

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H4

Disagree with Council's amber assessment, think the site should be red

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2095

Housing

Stank Hall Barn, Beeston LS11

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network. From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Site 2095 - Needs study; northern end might be green giving enabling development and neighbours to Listed Buildings and Scheduled Ancient Monument; southern part should be red. Red to amber.

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Site 2095 - Needs study; northern end might be green giving enabling development and neighbours to Listed Buildings and Scheduled Ancient Monument; southern part should be red. Red to amber.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2096

Housing

West Wood Road, Middleton LS10

Name: Mark Brennan

Representor No: PRS03782

Representation ID: REP01655 Question Ref: H1

With numerous disused brownfield sites within the 'outer south west' area it seems unbelievable that consideration is being given to the development of greenfield sites. The reason given by Leeds City Council that the brownfield sites are not to be developed is that remedial works would be too expensive. Should this be the case, it would suggest that these sites are heavily contaminated and pose a potential risk to human health and controlled waters. On this basis I would enquire why these sites are not being investigated as potential 'Part2A' sites. I feel it would make more sense developing the brownfield sites prior to targetting greenfield sites, as the risk and treatment of ground contamination is simply being ignored and delayed. Brownfield sites identified include but not limited to 2117, 2096, 2096A, 2096B, 2096C, 3075

Representation ID: REP01655 Question Ref: H3

Several brownfield sites as detailed earlier (namely 2096, 2096A - C, 3075' 3120, 1018A & B, 2127)

Name: Lisa Mulherin

Representor No: PRS05734

Representation ID: REP07126 Question Ref: H7

2096 West Wood Road, Middleton, 2099 Dunningley Hill Farm and 2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse – I support the Red designation of these sites for the reasons set out in the consultation document.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network. From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2098A

Housing

Sissons Farm, Middleton LS10

Name: Richard Marshall

Representor No: PRS03170

Representation ID: REP01024 Question Ref: H5

1079, 1072, 1077, 1143B, 1143D, 1171B, 1200A, 1258, 1284a, 1285, 1344, 2098a, 3365, 3456A.2098C, 2105, 2155, 3000, 3056.3064, 3078A, 4004, and 4029. As previously stated the amber sites that are greenbelt land should not be considered for development. Site 1032 is designated as a protected area of search this land has been retained along the edge of the existing settlement pending more suitable sites being found in the longer term this site should only be developed as a last resort.

Representation ID: REP01024 Question Ref: H2

1079, 1072, 1077, 1143B, 1143D, 1171B, 1200A, 1258, 1284a, 1285, 1344, 2098a, 3365, 3456A. All these sites are green belt sites , green belt land is there to stop urban sprawl and the destruction of the countryside that still remains in this area. If sites 1143B, 1143D, 1143F, 2155, 1274, 1032, and 2128 are built on East Ardsley West Ardsley and Tingley will just become one built up area hemmed in by the M62. Not all of these are greenbelt sites but if the development is allowed the basic principal of having greenbelt in this area will be completely wrecked!

Name: Mark Brennan

Representor No: PRS03782

Representation ID: REP01655 Question Ref: H1

With numerous disused brownfield sites within the 'outer south west' area it seems unbelievable that consideration is being given to the development of greenfield sites. The reason given by Leeds City Council that the brownfield sites are not to be developed is that remedial works would be too expensive. Should this be the case, it would suggest that these sites are heavily contaminated and pose a potential risk to human health and controlled waters. On this basis I would enquire why these sites are not being investigated as potential 'Part 2A' sites. I feel it would make more sense developing the brownfield sites prior to targetting greenfield sites, as the risk and treatment of ground contamination is simply being ignored and delayed. Brownfield sites identified include but not limited to 2117, 2096, 2096A, 2096B, 2096C, 3075

Representation ID: REP01655 Question Ref: H3

Several brownfield sites as detailed earlier (namely 2096, 2096A - C, 3075' 3120, 1018A & B, 2127)

Name: Mark Mills

Representor No: PRS06341

Representation ID: REP07302 Question Ref: H1

2098A – Sissons Farm Support allocation of site for housing.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 4 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' and 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network.

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network)

From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service frequency levels.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites - green sites are linked to this comment]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2098A

Housing

Sissons Farm, Middleton LS10

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H1

Agree with green allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H1

Agree with green allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2098B

Housing

Sissons Farm, Middleton LS10

Name: Mark Brennan

Representor No: PRS03782

Representation ID: REP01655 Question Ref: H1

With numerous disused brownfield sites within the 'outer south west' area it seems unbelievable that consideration is being given to the development of greenfield sites. The reason given by Leeds City Council that the brownfield sites are not to be developed is that remedial works would be too expensive. Should this be the case, it would suggest that these sites are heavily contaminated and pose a potential risk to human health and controlled waters. On this basis I would enquire why these sites are not being investigated as potential 'Part2A' sites. I feel it would make more sense developing the brownfield sites prior to targetting greenfield sites, as the risk and treatment of ground contamination is simply being ignored and delayed. Brownfield sites identified include but not limited to 2117, 2096, 2096A, 2096B, 2096C, 3075

Representation ID: REP01655 Question Ref: H3

Several brownfield sites as detailed earlier (namely 2096, 2096A - C, 3075' 3120, 1018A & B, 2127)

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 - Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network. From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2098C

Housing

Sissons Farm, Middleton LS10

Name: Richard Marshall

Representor No: PRS03170

Representation ID: REP01024 Question Ref: H4

2098C, 2105, 2155, 3000, 3056,3064, 3078A, 4004, and 4029. As previously stated the amber sites that are greenbelt land should not be considered for development.

Representation ID: REP01024 Question Ref: H5

1079, 1072, 1077, 1143B, 1143D, 1171B, 1200A, 1258, 1284a, 1285, 1344, 2098a, 3365, 3456A.2098C, 2105, 2155, 3000, 3056,3064, 3078A, 4004, and 4029. As previously stated the amber sites that are greenbelt land should not be considered for development. Site 1032 is designated as a protected area of search this land has been retained along the edge of the existing settlement pending more suitable sites being found in the longer term this site should only be developed as a last resort.

Name: Mark Brennan

Representor No: PRS03782

Representation ID: REP01655 Question Ref: H1

With numerous disused brownfield sites within the "outer south west" area it seems unbelievable that consideration is being given to the development of greenfield sites. The reason given by Leeds City Council that the brownfield sites are not to be developed is that remedial works would be too expensive. Should this be the case, it would suggest that these sites are heavily contaminated and pose a potential risk to human health and controlled waters. On this basis I would enquire why these sites are not being investigated as potential "Part2A" sites. I feel it would make more sense developing the brownfield sites prior to targetting greenfield sites, as the risk and treatment of ground contamination is simply being ignored and delayed. Brownfield sites identified include but not limited to 2117, 2096, 2096A,2096B,2096C, 3075

Representation ID: REP01655 Question Ref: H3

Several brownfield sites as detailed earlier (namely 2096, 2096A - C, 3075' 3120, 1018A & B, 2127)

Name: Mark Mills

Representor No: PRS06341

Representation ID: REP07302 Question Ref: H4

2098C Support allocation of site for housing. Site could be considered alongside 2098A and any opportunities to reconfigure and access site from Sissons Road.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2098C

Housing

Sissons Farm, Middleton LS10

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H4

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Amber Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are be minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H4

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 4 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' and 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network.

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network)

From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service frequency levels.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites - amber sites are linked to this comment]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H4

Disagree with Council's amber assessment, think the site should be green

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H4

Site 2098C - Would be a narrow extension at the edge of an estate before land falls away from the Middleton plateau. Amber to green.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2098C

Housing

Sissons Farm, Middleton LS10

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H4

Site 2098C - Would be a narrow extension at the edge of an estate before land falls away from the Middleton plateau. Amber to green.

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H4

Disagree with Council's amber assessment, think the site should be green

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2099

Housing

Dunningley Hill, Tingley WF3

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network. From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2100B

Housing

Throstle Lane Playing Fields, Middleton LS10

Name: Brian Guy

Representor No: PRS00142

Representation ID: REP05028 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05028 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: Wenda P Whitehead

Representor No: PRS00312

Representation ID: REP05048 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05048 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: Janice Beever

Representor No: PRS00441

Representation ID: REP05051 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05051 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: P S Barrie

Representor No: PRS00915

Representation ID: REP05064 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05045 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05034 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05045 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05064 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05034 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: Lynne Paul

Representor No: PRS01169

Representation ID: REP05057 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05057 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2100B

Housing

Throstle Lane Playing Fields, Middleton LS10

Name: D Paul

Representor No: PRS01183

Representation ID: REP05053 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05053 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: B Stringer

Representor No: PRS01606

Representation ID: REP05055 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05055 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: L.e Beaver

Representor No: PRS01607

Representation ID: REP05060 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05060 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: J Cowie

Representor No: PRS02227

Representation ID: REP05033 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05033 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: Susan Holt

Representor No: PRS02289

Representation ID: REP05037 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05037 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: Dereck Holt

Representor No: PRS02311

Representation ID: REP05031 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05031 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2100B

Housing

Throstle Lane Playing Fields, Middleton LS10

Name: Jenni Davenport

Representor No: PRS02330

Representation ID: REP05035 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05035 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: Frank Raven

Representor No: PRS02339

Representation ID: REP05036 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05036 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: E Naylor

Representor No: PRS02363

Representation ID: REP05044 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05044 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: Kathleen Paver

Representor No: PRS02372

Representation ID: REP05039 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05039 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: C Guy

Representor No: PRS02377

Representation ID: REP05032 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05032 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: C Clegg

Representor No: PRS02406

Representation ID: REP05029 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05029 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2100B

Housing

Throstle Lane Playing Fields, Middleton LS10

Name: Doreen Gill

Representor No: PRS02496

Representation ID: REP05030 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05030 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: D Naylor

Representor No: PRS02497

Representation ID: REP05038 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05038 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: A Paver

Representor No: PRS02498

Representation ID: REP05040 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05040 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: James Bowers

Representor No: PRS02500

Representation ID: REP05041 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05041 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: Alan Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02501

Representation ID: REP05042 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05042 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: Vivienne Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02502

Representation ID: REP05043 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05043 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2100B

Housing

Throstle Lane Playing Fields, Middleton LS10

Name: Vivian Oxtoby

Representor No: PRS02504

Representation ID: REP05046 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05046 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: Beryl Hewitt

Representor No: PRS02506

Representation ID: REP05047 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05047 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: D A Clegg

Representor No: PRS02507

Representation ID: REP05049 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05049 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: Pauline Wood

Representor No: PRS02508

Representation ID: REP05050 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05050 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: Joyce Thompson

Representor No: PRS02510

Representation ID: REP05052 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05052 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: Patricia Aston

Representor No: PRS02513

Representation ID: REP05054 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05054 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2100B

Housing

Throstle Lane Playing Fields, Middleton LS10

Name: L. G Wilson

Representor No: PRS02515

Representation ID: REP05056 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05056 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: S Laurence

Representor No: PRS02517

Representation ID: REP05058 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05058 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: C Graham

Representor No: PRS02518

Representation ID: REP05059 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05059 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: M Allsop

Representor No: PRS02520

Representation ID: REP05061 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05061 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: R Hartill

Representor No: PRS02521

Representation ID: REP05062 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05062 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: Edith Holmes

Representor No: PRS02522

Representation ID: REP05063 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05063 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2100B

Housing

Throstle Lane Playing Fields, Middleton LS10

Name: Harry Holmes

Representor No: PRS02524

Representation ID: REP05065 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05065 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: Ann Morse

Representor No: PRS02526

Representation ID: REP05066 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05066 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: L.r Morse

Representor No: PRS02527

Representation ID: REP05067 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05067 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: Michael Hartill

Representor No: PRS02556

Representation ID: REP05068 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05068 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: Jim Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02561

Representation ID: REP05069 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05069 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: Helen Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02562

Representation ID: REP05070 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05070 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2100B

Housing

Throstle Lane Playing Fields, Middleton LS10

Name: Ronald Gill

Representor No: PRS02564

Representation ID: REP05072 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05072 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: A.w Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02565

Representation ID: REP05073 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05073 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: J Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02566

Representation ID: REP05074 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05074 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: Norman Dearden

Representor No: PRS02568

Representation ID: REP05071 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Representation ID: REP05071 Question Ref: G15

Site ref 2100B should be retained as green space.

Name: Jacqueline Squire

Representor No: PRS04321

Representation ID: REP00393 Question Ref: G15

Not familiar with this area

Name: Mark Mills

Representor No: PRS06341

Representation ID: REP07302 Question Ref: H7

2100B – Playing Fields Throstle Lane Potential to consider this site and overall provision of greenspace alongside 2100A to ensure that greenspace is not marginalised or hidden. Frontage of site along Throstle Terrace has been made available as a result of housing clearance.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2100B

Housing

Throstle Lane Playing Fields, Middleton LS10

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network. From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2104

Housing

Leeds Road, Lofthouse WF3

Name: Brian Guy

Representor No: PRS00142

Representation ID: REP04659 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Wenda P Whitehead

Representor No: PRS00312

Representation ID: REP04786 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Janice Beever

Representor No: PRS00441

Representation ID: REP04791 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: P S Barrie

Representor No: PRS00915

Representation ID: REP04781 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Representation ID: REP04769 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Representation ID: REP04810 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Lynne Paul

Representor No: PRS01169

Representation ID: REP04800 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: D Paul

Representor No: PRS01183

Representation ID: REP04793 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2104

Housing

Leeds Road, Lofthouse WF3

Name: B Stringer

Representor No: PRS01606

Representation ID: REP04797 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: L.e Beever

Representor No: PRS01607

Representation ID: REP04804 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: J Cowie

Representor No: PRS02227

Representation ID: REP04768 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Susan Holt

Representor No: PRS02289

Representation ID: REP04772 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Dereck Holt

Representor No: PRS02311

Representation ID: REP04766 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Jenni Davenport

Representor No: PRS02330

Representation ID: REP04770 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Frank Raven

Representor No: PRS02339

Representation ID: REP04771 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2104

Housing

Leeds Road, Lofthouse WF3

Name: E Naylor

Representor No: PRS02363

Representation ID: REP04780 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Kathleen Paver

Representor No: PRS02372

Representation ID: REP04774 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: C Guy

Representor No: PRS02377

Representation ID: REP04767 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: C Clegg

Representor No: PRS02406

Representation ID: REP04663 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Doreen Gill

Representor No: PRS02496

Representation ID: REP04755 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: D Naylor

Representor No: PRS02497

Representation ID: REP04773 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: A Paver

Representor No: PRS02498

Representation ID: REP04775 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2104

Housing

Leeds Road, Lofthouse WF3

Name: James Bowers

Representor No: PRS02500

Representation ID: REP04777 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Alan Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02501

Representation ID: REP04778 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Vivienne Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02502

Representation ID: REP04779 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Vivian Oxtoby

Representor No: PRS02504

Representation ID: REP04783 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Beryl Hewitt

Representor No: PRS02506

Representation ID: REP04785 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: D A Clegg

Representor No: PRS02507

Representation ID: REP04788 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Pauline Wood

Representor No: PRS02508

Representation ID: REP04790 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2104

Housing

Leeds Road, Lofthouse WF3

Name: Joyce Thompson

Representor No: PRS02510

Representation ID: REP04792 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Patricia Aston

Representor No: PRS02513

Representation ID: REP04796 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: L. G Wilson

Representor No: PRS02515

Representation ID: REP04799 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: S Laurence

Representor No: PRS02517

Representation ID: REP04801 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: C Graham

Representor No: PRS02518

Representation ID: REP04803 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: M Allsop

Representor No: PRS02520

Representation ID: REP04805 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: R Hartill

Representor No: PRS02521

Representation ID: REP04806 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2104

Housing

Leeds Road, Lofthouse WF3

Name: Edith Holmes

Representor No: PRS02522

Representation ID: REP04808 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Harry Holmes

Representor No: PRS02524

Representation ID: REP04811 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Ann Morse

Representor No: PRS02526

Representation ID: REP04813 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: L.r Morse

Representor No: PRS02527

Representation ID: REP04816 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Michael Hartill

Representor No: PRS02556

Representation ID: REP04847 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Jim Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02561

Representation ID: REP04852 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Helen Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02562

Representation ID: REP04855 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2104

Housing

Leeds Road, Lofthouse WF3

Name: Ronald Gill

Representor No: PRS02564

Representation ID: REP04858 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: A.w Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02565

Representation ID: REP04859 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: J Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02566

Representation ID: REP04860 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: Norman Dearden

Representor No: PRS02568

Representation ID: REP04857 Question Ref: H7

2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse, Site Capacity 267, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood.

This site adjoins sites 3085 (green) and 3084 (red) in the Outer South area. Taken in the round the three sites together could be deemed to round off the community of Lofthouse.

Name: J & J Prescott

Representor No: PRS04996

Representation ID: REP02008 Question Ref: H7

3320 better identified as amber. Relates well to settlement pattern and not as drawn an isolated allocation for which see plan to be annexed. Site 2104, Westfield considered also as an appropriate candidate if additional numbers are required.

Representation ID: REP02008 Question Ref: H11

medium long term

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2104

Housing

Leeds Road, Lofthouse WF3

Name: Lisa Mulherin

Representor No: PRS05734

Representation ID: REP07126 Question Ref: H7

1030 Pymont Farm - I agree that this should be red for the reasons set out in the consultation document – GreenBelt, access and that it does not relate well to the existing development. If development were allowed on this site it would also make it more difficult to protect the rest of the Green Belt around this site. Residents have suggested that this site might make a useful extension to the cemetery.

1050 Land off Westfield Road – I agree that this site should be red for the reasons set out in the consultation document. Green Belt, scale doesn't relate well to existing settlement and would result in significant urban sprawl.

2103 Allotments Copley Lane – I support the designation of this site as Red. In response to question G9 this site and the neighbouring site need to be retained as an important local amenity greenspace – they are currently used for allotments, a community orchard and community garden.

2104 Leeds Road Lofthouse – I support the designation of this site as Red for the reasons set out in the consultation document.

3084 Cemetery Lane, Lofthouse – I support the designation of this site as Red for the reasons set out in the consultation document.

3445B Leadwell Lane, Robin Hood – I support the designation of this site as Red. Again this is a Green Belt site and one that is not connected to the existing residential area. The site is significant in size and scale and would have a harmful impact on the Green Belt function of separating settlements – in this case Robin Hood and its neighbouring town of Rothwell.

173 The Peg Football Ground, East Ardsley – I support this designation as Red for the reasons set out in the consultation document.

314 Boyle Hall, West Ardsley – I support the Red designation of this site for the reasons set out in the consultation document.

1067A off Woodhouse Lane – I wholeheartedly support the Red designation of this site. Development here would lead to unrestricted urban sprawl into the Green Belt as well as being unsustainable in school, GP surgery and public transport terms.

1068 Stoney Lane, East Ardsley – I support the Red designation of this site for the reasons set out in the consultation document.

1143A Land off Old Thorpe Lane, Tingley – This site is not suitable for development and should stay Red. It is Green Belt, would be contingent on development on the neighbouring site, therefore resulting in an unsustainable level of new housing in this one location and would result in urban sprawl. Concerns have also been raised by a resident about the air pollution levels which are significant in this vicinity near to the motorway and Tingley roundabout. Pollution levels should be thoroughly checked out in this area and around junction 41 before any further housing is built in either of these two locations.

1143C Spinkwell Lane Playing Fields, Tingley – this site should be protected as playing fields. It is not suitable for housing!

1143E Tingley Athletic Ground, East Ardsley – as per comments for 1143C this site should be protected for playing fields. It is not suitable for housing!

1260 N and S of Batley Road, West Ardsley – a completely unacceptable and unsustainable scale of development. The site is Green Belt. This would lead to erosion of the separation between districts and intolerable pressure on the very limited local amenities.

2096 West Wood Road, Middleton, 2099 Dunningley Hill Farm and 2104 Leeds Road, Lofthouse – I support the Red designation of these sites for the reasons set out in the consultation document.

3075 Scrapyard, Thorpe Lane, Middleton – Whilst supposed to be Green Belt this site is currently in use as a scrap yard. Enforcement action is being sought by a Middleton Councillor. The site as it stands extends too far to the South and is not well enough connected to existing settlements. Access onto Thorpe Lane would also need to be well thought out given the bend in the road here.

3320 Thorpe Villa and Middleton Lane, Thorpe – I support the Red designation of this site for the reasons set out in the consultation document and because of the need to retain the separation between settlements.

3372 East of Baghill Road - I support the Red designation of this site for the reasons set out in the consultation document.

3373B Haigh Wood, West Ardsley - I support the Red designation of this site for the reasons set out in the consultation document. This wood is well used and much loved by the local community and walkers and cyclists from further afield and must be protected.

3456B Ardsley Reservoir - I support the Red designation of this site for the reasons set out in the consultation document and because it would lead to the erosion of the separation between the villages of East and West Ardsley.

Name: Carlton Neighbourhood Association

Representor No: PRS06375

Representation ID: REP07379 Question Ref: H7

2104 - Agree should be red - see submitted representation for full details.

This site is Green Belt land and its development would represent significant sprawl in relation to the size of the settlement. It also does not connect well to existing dwellings and hosts a Local Nature Area in the northern section.

Development of the site would mean the loss of the railway embankment that is used for recreation and pastimes, and is home to an abundance of wildlife (including the occasional deer).

The size of the development upon this site is also disproportionate in relation to the existing settlement.

The CVRA considers this site inappropriate for development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2104

Housing

Leeds Road, Lofthouse WF3

Name: Justin Coley

Representor No: PRS06448

Representation ID: REP07524 Question Ref: H7

SITE 2104 Leeds Road Lofthouse

This site is Green Belt land and its development would represent significant sprawl in relation to the size of the settlement. It also does not connect well to existing dwellings and hosts a Local Nature Area in the northern section.

Development of the site would mean the loss of the railway embankment that is used for recreation and pastimes, and is home to an abundance of wildlife (including the occasional deer).

The size of the development upon this site is also disproportionate in relation to the existing settlement.

The CVRA considers this site inappropriate for development

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network. From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2105

Housing

East Ardsley Adult Training Centre, Tingley WF3

Name: Brian Guy

Representor No: PRS00142

Representation ID: REP05028 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05028 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: Wenda P Whitehead

Representor No: PRS00312

Representation ID: REP05048 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05048 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: Janice Beever

Representor No: PRS00441

Representation ID: REP05051 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05051 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: P S Barrie

Representor No: PRS00915

Representation ID: REP05064 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05045 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05034 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05045 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05064 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05034 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: Lynne Paul

Representor No: PRS01169

Representation ID: REP05057 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05057 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2105

Housing

East Ardsley Adult Training Centre, Tingley WF3

Name: D Paul

Representor No: PRS01183

Representation ID: REP05053 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05053 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: B Stringer

Representor No: PRS01606

Representation ID: REP05055 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05055 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: L.e Beever

Representor No: PRS01607

Representation ID: REP05060 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05060 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: Jack Dunn

Representor No: PRS02207

Representation ID: REP04440 Question Ref: G16

2105 –
Should be a red site. The site is designated green space and was used as a football pitch the site currently is been used for agriculture. 106 funds could restore it to the previous use for sport or other recreational purposes.

Representation ID: REP04440 Question Ref: G16

2105 –
Should be a red site. The site is designated green space and was used as a football pitch the site currently is been used for agriculture. 106 funds could restore it to the previous use for sport or other recreational purposes.

Name: J Cowie

Representor No: PRS02227

Representation ID: REP05033 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05033 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: Susan Holt

Representor No: PRS02289

Representation ID: REP05037 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05037 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2105

Housing

East Ardsley Adult Training Centre, Tingley WF3

Name: Dereck Holt

Representor No: PRS02311

Representation ID: REP05031 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05031 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: Jenni Davenport

Representor No: PRS02330

Representation ID: REP05035 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05035 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: Frank Raven

Representor No: PRS02339

Representation ID: REP05036 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05036 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: E Naylor

Representor No: PRS02363

Representation ID: REP05044 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05044 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: Kathleen Paver

Representor No: PRS02372

Representation ID: REP05039 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05039 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: C Guy

Representor No: PRS02377

Representation ID: REP05032 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05032 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2105

Housing

East Ardsley Adult Training Centre, Tingley WF3

Name: C Clegg

Representor No: PRS02406

Representation ID: REP05029 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05029 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: Doreen Gill

Representor No: PRS02496

Representation ID: REP05030 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05030 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: D Naylor

Representor No: PRS02497

Representation ID: REP05038 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05038 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: A Paver

Representor No: PRS02498

Representation ID: REP05040 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05040 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: James Bowers

Representor No: PRS02500

Representation ID: REP05041 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05041 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: Alan Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02501

Representation ID: REP05042 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05042 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2105

Housing

East Ardsley Adult Training Centre, Tingley WF3

Name: Vivienne Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02502

Representation ID: REP05043 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05043 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: Vivian Oxtoby

Representor No: PRS02504

Representation ID: REP05046 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05046 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: Beryl Hewitt

Representor No: PRS02506

Representation ID: REP05047 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05047 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: D A Clegg

Representor No: PRS02507

Representation ID: REP05049 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05049 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: Pauline Wood

Representor No: PRS02508

Representation ID: REP05050 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05050 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: Joyce Thompson

Representor No: PRS02510

Representation ID: REP05052 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05052 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2105

Housing

East Ardsley Adult Training Centre, Tingley WF3

Name: Patricia Aston

Representor No: PRS02513

Representation ID: REP05054 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05054 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: L. G Wilson

Representor No: PRS02515

Representation ID: REP05056 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05056 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: S Laurence

Representor No: PRS02517

Representation ID: REP05058 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05058 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: C Graham

Representor No: PRS02518

Representation ID: REP05059 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05059 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: M Allsop

Representor No: PRS02520

Representation ID: REP05061 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05061 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: R Hartill

Representor No: PRS02521

Representation ID: REP05062 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05062 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2105

Housing

East Ardsley Adult Training Centre, Tingley WF3

Name: Edith Holmes

Representor No: PRS02522

Representation ID: REP05063 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05063 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: Harry Holmes

Representor No: PRS02524

Representation ID: REP05065 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05065 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: Ann Morse

Representor No: PRS02526

Representation ID: REP05066 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05066 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: L.r Morse

Representor No: PRS02527

Representation ID: REP05067 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05067 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: Michael Hartill

Representor No: PRS02556

Representation ID: REP05068 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05068 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: Jim Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02561

Representation ID: REP05069 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05069 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2105

Housing

East Ardsley Adult Training Centre, Tingley WF3

Name: Helen Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02562

Representation ID: REP05070 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05070 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: Ronald Gill

Representor No: PRS02564

Representation ID: REP05072 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05072 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: A.w Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02565

Representation ID: REP05073 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05073 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: J Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02566

Representation ID: REP05074 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05074 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: Norman Dearden

Representor No: PRS02568

Representation ID: REP05071 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Representation ID: REP05071 Question Ref: G16

Site ref 2105 could be released for housing.

Name: Richard Marshall

Representor No: PRS03170

Representation ID: REP01024 Question Ref: H4

2098C, 2105, 2155, 3000, 3056,3064, 3078A, 4004, and 4029. As previously stated the amber sites that are greenbelt land should not be considered for development.

Representation ID: REP01024 Question Ref: H5

1079, 1072, 1077, 1143B, 1143D, 1171B, 1200A, 1258, 1284a, 1285, 1344, 2098a, 3365, 3456A.2098C, 2105, 2155, 3000, 3056,3064, 3078A, 4004, and 4029. As previously stated the amber sites that are greenbelt land should not be considered for development. Site 1032 is designated as a protected area of search this land has been retained along the edge of the existing settlement pending more suitable sites being found in the longer term this site should only be developed as a last resort.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2105

Housing

East Ardsley Adult Training Centre, Tingley WF3

Name: Camille Leach

Representor No: PRS03615

Representation ID: REP00848 Question Ref: H3

site 2105 - good extension to existing settlement.141 - suitable for conversion in principle 309 to retain and enhance the listed building and the development land around it.site 1099B - no highways issues - contained site.

Name: Lisa Jackson

Representor No: PRS04076

Representation ID: REP01267 Question Ref: H5

Site ref 1274Reason - The current infrastructure in East Ardsley already cannot cope with the current population. The school is already full, with siblings of existing pupils already unable to gain a place at the same school. Local doctors surgeries no longer accept new patients from East Ardsley. The A650 Bradford Road already struggles to cope with the volume of traffic, with regular lengthy queues at various traffic lights in and around East Ardsley, which are particularly bad during morning and afternoon rush hours. Traffic actually grinds to a halt on the A650 when there are problems on the nearby motorway networks causing traffic to divert to avoid motorway delays. Further development would mean that there is strong likelihood that the current infrastructure would collapse under the pressure of an increase in population and traffic. Site ref - 2155Reason - The current infrastructure in East Ardsley already cannot cope with the current population. The school is already full, with siblings of existing pupils already unable to gain a place at the same school. Local doctors surgeries no longer accept new patients from East Ardsley. The A650 Bradford Road already struggles to cope with the volume of traffic, with regular lengthy queues at various traffic lights in and around East Ardsley, which are particularly bad during morning and afternoon rush hours. Traffic actually grinds to a halt on the A650 when there are problems on the nearby motorway networks causing traffic to divert to avoid motorway delays. Further development would mean that there is strong likelihood that the current infrastructure would collapse under the pressure of an increase in population and trafficSite ref - 2105Reason - The current infrastructure in East Ardsley already cannot cope with the current population. The school is already full, with siblings of existing pupils already unable to gain a place at the same school. Local doctors surgeries no longer accept new patients from East Ardsley. The A650 Bradford Road already struggles to cope with the volume of traffic, with regular lengthy queues at various traffic lights in and around East Ardsley, which are particularly bad during morning and afternoon rush hours. Traffic actually grinds to a halt on the A650 when there are problems on the nearby motorway networks causing traffic to divert to avoid motorway delays. Further development would mean that there is strong likelihood that the current infrastructure would collapse under the pressure of an increase in population and traffic

Name: Hoare

Representor No: PRS05410

Representation ID: REP06016 Question Ref: H4

2105 – East Ardsley Adult Training Centre, Tingley

4.34 This site is located on the southern edge of East Ardsley and is currently allocated in the Leeds UDP as a protected playing pitch. Both national and local planning policies stress the importance of protecting such areas given the important contribution they can make to the health and wellbeing of communities.

4.35 Such areas should not be built on unless it can be demonstrated that the land is surplus to requirements. Table 10.5.1 outlines the surpluses and deficiencies in different types of greenspace in the Outer South West area.

4.36 It clearly states that there is a deficiency of 0.47 Ha in the Ardsley and Robin Hood Area . Given this acceptance that there is a deficit, any future supplementary assessment would clearly fail.

4.37 Given the accepted importance of green space and the identified deficit in this area, the site should be discounted.

Recommendation – reclassify this site as ‘red’ due its current designation as a protected playing pitch and the importance of retaining such areas of land to meet the principles of the Framework.

Name: Helen Ledger

Representor No: PRS05424

Representation ID: REP06082 Question Ref: G16

G16 East Ardsley Training Centre, Tingley N6 allocation deletion.

Sport England's statutory role and our playing field policy will still apply on this playing field site. We would oppose its N6 allocation deletion as this would fail to recognise the site former use and current land use as playing fields/sport and recreation facilities.

The outer south west area has by far the worse deficiency in outdoor sport, something this site could help rectify. Regard has to be had to the evidence available and ensure if developed the outdoor sports facilities are replaced like for like in a suitable location.

Land no longer in use for sport is not an argument for its disposal to other uses. In Sport England's experience it is more likely this is down to the site owner closing the site off rather than lack of demand to make use of the playing field for sport.Furthermore assessment on whether other open space typologies are more suitable is required before this is lost to housing development

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2105

Housing

East Ardsley Adult Training Centre, Tingley WF3

Name: Lisa Mulherin

Representor No: PRS05734

Representation ID: REP07126 Question Ref: H4

2105 Healey Croft ATC, Tingley – A smaller scale development on this site might be acceptable. It is part brownfield. Part however should be retained for recreational greenspace. Given that my ward is deficient in outdoor sports and children and young people's equipped play I would welcome consideration of some different outdoor sports use for part of this site e.g. tennis courts.

Name: Neil Dawson

Representor No: PRS05884

Representation ID: REP06563 Question Ref: H4

Suggested sites from Amber to Red;

309
1067B
1069
1143F
1220A
1274
1275A
1279
1332
2105
2155
3000
3064
3078A
4004

These sites are almost all located within the existing Green Belt and expansion into the Green Belt would lead to increased urban sprawl between the various townships in the Outer South West, and lead to coalescence between communities

Development of the Green Belt sites would also reduce the open green area and provide encroachment into the countryside around Morley and other smaller townships.

In addition there is insufficient road capacity and little scope for expansion for other necessary services. There would be a requirement for new or upgrading of existing roads which would therefore favour development on sites that are already located within the Morley or the Leeds Urban areas rather than eroding the Green Belt further.

Site 3078A is close to potential development in Kirklees and could lead to the complete erosion of the Green Belt and open green space between Leeds and Kirklees.

Any further development at sites 1275A and 1279 would reduce the Green Belt between the existing residential boundary and the A653 Dewsbury Road to a narrow strip which would put pressure in future years to extend residential use further east.

See rep for full details.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2105

Housing

East Ardsley Adult Training Centre, Tingley WF3

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H4

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Amber Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are be minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H4

Agree with amber allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H4

Agree with amber allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2114

Housing

Gelderd Road, Wortley LS12

Name: Richard Coldron

Representor No: PRS04196

Representation ID: REP00327 Question Ref: H12

2114. Close to other sites

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2124

Housing

Spring Gardens Drighlington

Name: Susan Bell

Representor No: PRS00137

Representation ID: REP00909 Question Ref: H4

2124 - Red. Green Belt. This land is agricultural and being farmed. Excessive housing. Not enough schools, A650 busy road, dentist/health centres full.

Name: Elizabeth Mcdermott

Representor No: PRS00140

Representation ID: REP00914 Question Ref: H4

2124 - Amber to red. Green Belt. As above [comments re 3003]. The by-pass has greatly eased traffic on the A650. Further housing will again cause problems.

Name: Brian Guy

Representor No: PRS00142

Representation ID: REP04659 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North
Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: A Hampshire

Representor No: PRS00149

Representation ID: REP00923 Question Ref: H4

2124 - Red. Already several new builds nearby causing problems with sewage. I would like this site and 1334 made into a Natural England wooded area and become an amenity for the village - put a stop on building for all time.

Name: Wenda P Whitehead

Representor No: PRS00312

Representation ID: REP04786 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North
Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: L. A Mitchell

Representor No: PRS00327

Representation ID: REP02264 Question Ref: H4

2124 All sites in Drighlington should be red sites. Should be green belt, how can Wakefield Road cope with any more traffic, the roads are already coping with very heavy traffic where would access be. The new by pass is already full of traffic again the village does not have infrastructure for any more people, transport or houses. The schools are full. We had two schools, one has now closed, already the new school has had an extension - so where will all the children go? Why not refurbish the disused mill on Whitehall Road for housing instead of using green field sites?

Name: Doreen Goor

Representor No: PRS00329

Representation ID: REP02274 Question Ref: H4

Amber to red. 2124/1332 - Car access not suitable

Name: M. J Cousin

Representor No: PRS00330

Representation ID: REP02275 Question Ref: H4

2124, 1322 - Amber to red. The schools are full as are the dentists and health. Not enough shops, services or sewerage systems.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2124

Housing

Spring Gardens Drighlington

Name: P And K. H Copley

Representor No: PRS00331

Representation ID: REP02276 Question Ref: H4

Entrance and exits dangerous and not enough room.

Name: J Glazzard

Representor No: PRS00332

Representation ID: REP02277 Question Ref: H4

2124, 1332. Drighlington cannot take any more property/schools/doctors/sewage/shops. Roads overcrowded.

Name: Janice Beever

Representor No: PRS00441

Representation ID: REP04791 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North
Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: Jennifer Adams

Representor No: PRS00456

Representation ID: REP02404 Question Ref: H4

2124 – No, this proposal should not go ahead due to poor access to the main road and the proposed site would not have a defendable boundary.

Name: Paul Mountain

Representor No: PRS00515

Representation ID: REP02464 Question Ref: H4

This is not a Brownfield site. Brownfield sites should take priority. This is prime agricultural land and if developed would join Drighlington to Netherton.

Name: A Thornton

Representor No: PRS00524

Representation ID: REP02474 Question Ref: H4

2124 - Change from Amber to Red – Access to this site would be via site 3003 and once again in my opinion sufficient brown field sites are available.

Name: Elaine Thorton

Representor No: PRS00584

Representation ID: REP02542 Question Ref: H4

2124 - Land at Spring Gardens Drighlington. Amber to Red access to this site would be via site 3003 and once again in our opinion sufficient brown field sites are available.

Name: Susan Wood

Representor No: PRS00739

Representation ID: REP02742 Question Ref: H5

2124 – Building on this land would create even more sewerage and drainage problems for this area which already suffers badly from this. Indefensible boundaries. Access to already busy roads could be problematic. This has always been agricultural land.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2124

Housing

Spring Gardens Drighlington

Name: P S Barrie

Representor No: PRS00915

Representation ID: REP04769 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Representation ID: REP04810 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Representation ID: REP04781 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: Christine Clayton

Representor No: PRS01085

Representation ID: REP03149 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens, Drighlington Amber to Red

The greenfield site which separates Drighlington from Gildersome and keeps both Villages as separate communities

Name: David Clayton

Representor No: PRS01089

Representation ID: REP03153 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington - Amber to Red

The site is part of green field area which keeps Drighlington and Gildersome as separate communities with their own identities.

Name: Lynne Paul

Representor No: PRS01169

Representation ID: REP04800 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: D Paul

Representor No: PRS01183

Representation ID: REP04793 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: Geraldine Hoare

Representor No: PRS01300

Representation ID: REP03409 Question Ref: H9

2124 - Yes - should be red.

Large sewerage problem.

Bad access.

No defendable boundary.

Productive agricultural land.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2124

Housing

Spring Gardens Drighlington

Name: Pamela Adams

Representor No: PRS01318

Representation ID: REP03428 Question Ref: H4

2124 – No, this site should not be amber because of no good access in Drighlington is overloaded.
This site does not have a defensible boundary.

Name: L And C Wekhell And Wetton

Representor No: PRS01435

Representation ID: REP03565 Question Ref: H4

2124 - amber to red. We have enough new housing in Drighlington. One school, close proximity to busy J27, no green fields going to be left.
Utilise brownfield sites. Use houses which are out of commission.

Name: B Stringer

Representor No: PRS01606

Representation ID: REP04797 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North
Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: L.e Beaver

Representor No: PRS01607

Representation ID: REP04804 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North
Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: J Cowie

Representor No: PRS02227

Representation ID: REP04768 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North
Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: Susan Holt

Representor No: PRS02289

Representation ID: REP04772 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North
Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: Dereck Holt

Representor No: PRS02311

Representation ID: REP04766 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North
Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2124

Housing

Spring Gardens Drighlington

Name: Jenni Davenport

Representor No: PRS02330

Representation ID: REP04770 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: Frank Raven

Representor No: PRS02339

Representation ID: REP04771 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: E Naylor

Representor No: PRS02363

Representation ID: REP04780 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: Kathleen Paver

Representor No: PRS02372

Representation ID: REP04774 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: C Guy

Representor No: PRS02377

Representation ID: REP04767 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: C Clegg

Representor No: PRS02406

Representation ID: REP04663 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: Doreen Gill

Representor No: PRS02496

Representation ID: REP04755 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2124

Housing

Spring Gardens Drighlington

Name: D Naylor

Representor No: PRS02497

Representation ID: REP04773 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: A Paver

Representor No: PRS02498

Representation ID: REP04775 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: James Bowers

Representor No: PRS02500

Representation ID: REP04777 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: Alan Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02501

Representation ID: REP04778 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: Vivienne Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02502

Representation ID: REP04779 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: Vivian Oxtoby

Representor No: PRS02504

Representation ID: REP04783 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: Beryl Hewitt

Representor No: PRS02506

Representation ID: REP04785 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2124

Housing

Spring Gardens Drighlington

Name: D A Clegg

Representor No: PRS02507

Representation ID: REP04788 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: Pauline Wood

Representor No: PRS02508

Representation ID: REP04790 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: Joyce Thompson

Representor No: PRS02510

Representation ID: REP04792 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: Patricia Aston

Representor No: PRS02513

Representation ID: REP04796 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: L. G Wilson

Representor No: PRS02515

Representation ID: REP04799 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: S Laurence

Representor No: PRS02517

Representation ID: REP04801 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: C Graham

Representor No: PRS02518

Representation ID: REP04803 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2124

Housing

Spring Gardens Drighlington

Name: M Allsop

Representor No: PRS02520

Representation ID: REP04805 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: R Hartill

Representor No: PRS02521

Representation ID: REP04806 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: Edith Holmes

Representor No: PRS02522

Representation ID: REP04808 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: Harry Holmes

Representor No: PRS02524

Representation ID: REP04811 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: Ann Morse

Representor No: PRS02526

Representation ID: REP04813 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: L.r Morse

Representor No: PRS02527

Representation ID: REP04816 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: Michael Hartill

Representor No: PRS02556

Representation ID: REP04847 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2124

Housing

Spring Gardens Drighlington

Name: Jim Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02561

Representation ID: REP04852 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: Helen Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02562

Representation ID: REP04855 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: Ronald Gill

Representor No: PRS02564

Representation ID: REP04858 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: A.w Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02565

Representation ID: REP04859 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: J Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02566

Representation ID: REP04860 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: Norman Dearden

Representor No: PRS02568

Representation ID: REP04857 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Site Capacity 208, Ward Morley North

Would need access through another, smaller development giving an overall development size of 256 households. The site is bounded by an area considered not to be suitable for housing development and so would be a discreet addition to the existing settlement. The concerns regarding infrastructure and access to main roads apply to this site.

Name: Russell Doherty

Representor No: PRS02666

Representation ID: REP05118 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Garden

NO. This site would be ideal for a new school much needed in Drighlington – being central. Also, much need OAP housing as easy access to shops etc.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2124

Housing

Spring Gardens Drighlington

Name: Arthur Thornton

Representor No: PRS02730

Representation ID: REP05188 Question Ref: H4

2124 –Land at Spring Gardens Drighlington. Amber to Red access to this site would be via site 3003 and once again in our opinion sufficient brown field sites are available.

Name: Gemma Wood

Representor No: PRS05077

Representation ID: REP05644 Question Ref: H4

No. There is no suitable access to this site. And Drighlington's drainage system (foul water) 'leaks' below the site. So this site should be 'Red'. It has no defensible boundary

Name: Miller Homes

Representor No: PRS05125

Representation ID: REP06465 Question Ref: H1

Site 2124

We object to the rating of site reference 2124, Spring Gardens, Drighlington as Amber (sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as Green sites). We believe this site should be rated Green in the Site Allocations plan.

See also representation submitted for full details.

Representation ID: REP06465 Question Ref: H11

Site 2124

Conclusions

The site at Spring Gardens is currently allocated as safeguarded land. The draft Core Strategy confirms that PAS safeguarded land will provide one of the prime sources for housing allocations within the LDF Allocations Document. The site is in a sustainable location as demonstrated by the sustainability plan. The site is close to local services, retail parks, schools and health facilities. The site is also well located to access local employment areas, particularly those around Junction 27 of the M62. The site is within the settlement limits of Drighlington and is adjacent to residential development on three sides. The Outer South West housing market area has a significant housing requirement and the development of this site could make a contribution towards this.

No major physical or environmental constraints have been identified on this site which would preclude its development. The site has the potential to deliver a range of benefits:

- ☐ Delivery of new family housing including open market homes and affordable housing
- ☐ Direct and indirect construction jobs
- ☐ 106 monies in transport, education, public open space
- ☐ Increased expenditure in the local economy
- ☐ New Homes Bonus
- ☐ Provision of new public open space

The site is deliverable when considered against the definition of deliverable in the Framework (footnote 11 of paragraph 47). The site is available now given the agreement in place between the landowners and a national housebuilder. The site is in a sustainable location, suitable for the delivery of housing as detailed in this response. There are no insurmountable physical problems of limitations and as such the site is considered to be suitable for housing. It is considered that this is an achievable site, which has a realistic prospect of being delivered within 5 years; there are no known viability issues restricting the site from coming forward.

Therefore for the reasons set out above, we support the housing allocation of site reference 2124, Spring Gardens, Drighlington.

See also representation submitted for full details.

Name: Alan Hoare

Representor No: PRS05284

Representation ID: REP05878 Question Ref: H7

2124 Spring Gardens. Yes this site should be Red. Large sewerage problem. Bad Access. No Defensible Boundary. Good Agri.land.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2124

Housing

Spring Gardens Drighlington

Name: Abigail Doherty

Representor No: PRS05323

Representation ID: REP05914 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens No. Amber to Red

Large drainage and sewerage problem in Drighlington. Bad access problem's no defensible boundary. This site should be red.

Name: Samuel Wood

Representor No: PRS05348

Representation ID: REP05934 Question Ref: H4

2124 Spring Gardens. Amber to Red.

Yes this site should be red as it has no access and drainage problems and will add top urban sprawl.

Name: Hoare

Representor No: PRS05410

Representation ID: REP06016 Question Ref: H4

2124 – Spring Gardens, Drighlington

4.21 This is a Greenfield site located on the northern edge of Drighlington. The site is currently identified within the UDP as an area of PAS.

4.22 Our immediate concerns relate to the proposed site access and therefore its deliverability. Access into the site is anticipated to be via site 3003. The proforma for the site details the comments of the councils highways department and states that access through site 3003 'is unsuitable for large development'

4.23 The thoughts of the highways department are clear. Given this is the only suitable access into the site this raises a serious question mark over its deliverability.

Recommendation – reclassify the site in 'red' due to the level of uncertainty surrounding the access arrangements

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H4

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Amber Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H4

Agree with amber allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2124

Housing

Spring Gardens Drighlington

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H4

Agree with amber allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: A D Barr

Representor No: PRS00109

Representation ID: REP00515 Question Ref: H1

Change suggested - Green to Red Reason for change - It is inappropriate to use allotments for housing.

Name: Brian Guy

Representor No: PRS00142

Representation ID: REP04659 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Joyce Sanders

Representor No: PRS00148

Representation ID: REP00922 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Red. Brownfield site. We have plenty. Congestion for our roads will be appalling. Plus noise from motorway.

Name: Dawn Commons

Representor No: PRS00166

Representation ID: REP01839 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Change from Green to Red. Heavy traffic congestion at peak times, Churwell will not be a village and will become joined up to Morley.

Name: John Hardy

Representor No: PRS00192

Representation ID: REP02112 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Change from Green to Red. Green Belt/Insufficient amenities (schools ect)/traffic/congestion issues.

Name: Ian Evans

Representor No: PRS00196

Representation ID: REP02123 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Green to red. Road infrastructure currently too congested at peak hours will cause gridlock. Local school report shortage of primary school places from 2014, local roads in poor state of repair.

Name: Michael Devlin

Representor No: PRS00197

Representation ID: REP02126 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Change from Green to Red. The traffic coming off the site would seriously add to an already overloaded area. Manor Farm Drive is not an easy road to negotiate due to severe blind bends, even bin lorries have difficulty.

Name: Kevin Doherty

Representor No: PRS00200

Representation ID: REP02133 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Green to red. Council has already flooded Churwell with new houses via Churwell village. So many people get exercise along here and in the fields out back. The council is destroying the community and turning it into an extended city centre.

Name: I Cralshaw

Representor No: PRS00208

Representation ID: REP02143 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Change from Green to Red. Green Belt/Insufficient amenities (schools ect)/Traffic/congestion issues.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: Andrea Armstrong

Representor No: PRS00210

Representation ID: REP05381 Question Ref: H1

As residents of Churwell, we are writing with regard to the proposed housing development sites within our local community. We all share the boundary of one of the sites in question, Site 1220A 'Land East of Churwell', and are particularly concerned over any possible proposal to build in this location. We understand this is currently classified as 'Amber: Sites which have potential but issues / not as favoured as green sites'. As clearly some of the issues have already been identified, we would like to re-iterate and clarify some of the issues that are of greatest concern to us as residents immediately neighbouring this location. Churwell Hill / Elland Road is the main road from Morley towards Leeds, and as such suffers from a very high volume of traffic, particularly at commuting hours, when the traffic is at standstill to and from the Ring Road. This road does not have the ability to cope with greater volumes of traffic passing through the area, without creating greater risks to safety (cyclists, pedestrians, drivers) and increased congestion. This has already been identified as an issue as there are a number of speed cameras within a short space along this road. This particular site, lies next to a busy train line, again posing dangers to locals, as it is not unusual for us to see people walking next to or crossing over the train line. This risk would only increase with additional housing in the area. Additionally, we understand the site has been identified as a historical land-fill area, again highlighting unsuitability. Regarding the 6 sites identified in Churwell overall, the general infrastructure within the village is not of a scale that could accommodate such volumes of new houses, schools, doctors, dentists, and services in general would not be able to take on a new influx of residents. Based on these, and other points, we strongly support the re-classification of this area (Site 1220A), and the other proposed Churwell sites, to colour code 'Red: Sites not considered suitable for allocation of housing'. Instead, we would ask the Planning Department to look at the areas within Leeds City Council that already have planning permission, and also, to revitalise housing currently standing empty, rather than look to build on Greenfield areas.

Name: Joanna Coultous & Stephen Seale

Representor No: PRS00289

Representation ID: REP02230 Question Ref: H1

1282 / I am writing to voice my objection to Leeds City Councils LDF Site allocation plans in Churwell.

I have lived in Churwell since August 2000. We moved here because we were impressed by the green spaces around and the woodland area which surrounds our home. We also access Pit Hill for walking and the fantastic views across Leeds. During the Autumn there is a community bonfire which is attended by many of the local people. In winter and snowy weather it is used for sledging and again an opportunity for the local people to have recreational enjoyment.

Despite what the farmer who owns the land says it has only been ploughed twice since I have lived here. Once was just before the application for Village green status! It has always been an open space for people to enjoy. It would be a tragedy for it to be built on not only because of the impact on local people and the loss of yet another green area but the devastating impact on traffic along Churwell Hill.

Anyone who uses Churwell Hill on a daily basis to get to work has a constant battle and sometimes the traffic is backed up to the top of Westwoodside. The building of the 'New Village' has added to the chaos and that project should be a warning to planners of the negative impact thoughtless building has on a community. The road itself is breaking up under the pressure of the traffic. Heavy plant and construction would cause further inconvenience to motorists at peak times. It is to my mind, a vision of hell.

Whilst living in Churwell I have been unable to access a local dentist as they are all chock a block. I have to travel to Bromley to have my teeth seen to. I have also seen the growth of the local school and the fact that many of my neighbour's children cannot get a place there.

Churwell is a lovely place to live but it appears that due to its very popularity planners see it as an easy target to build on. Surely there are lots of areas around Leeds that could be used or is there some political agenda going on. I am not a NIMBY as I realise that people need homes but there is also a need for open spaces for those people to enjoy.

It would be totally unsustainable if the proposed 1248 were to be built in Churwell. The plans should at least include provision for a new Primary school, High school, medical centre, church and shops as well as creating a way into the Village that does not involve spilling onto Churwell Hill. Without the infra structure it would be untenable.

I hope that sense prevails over profit and these plans are altered or dropped completely. I for one would be happy to take civil action against any of these plans. It seems that there is no real need in this area for this housing and the introduction of at least 5000 people and possibly over 3000 extra cars which would add pollution and overcrowding of already overcrowded amenities. How many people on the planning committee live in Morley or Churwell or would consider moving into these superfluous dwellings? Leave Churwell alone and let us enjoy what remains of the open spaces we have.

It would be a great shame if Churwell Park were to be the only green space left in Churwell.

Yours truly,

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: M Oddy

Representor No: PRS00297

Representation ID: REP02236 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Green to red. Because Churwell Hill is far too busy, Churwell schools are full to capacity as are schools in Morley. These plans are ridiculous.

Name: Janet Harrison

Representor No: PRS00304

Representation ID: REP02245 Question Ref: H1

Site 1282 - Laneside Farm (suggested capacity 542 houses).

Site 2125 - Manor House Farm (suggested capacity 77 houses).

I WISH THE ABOVE SITES TO BE COLOUR CODED RED

I wish to object to the above plans for the following reasons:-

Traffic Congestion; Elland/Victoria Road which runs the length of Churwell has an enormous amount of traffic during the main rush-hour and now a days during the off peak hours as well. How would building an estimated 1,248 houses, all of which will need to use this road for access, be of anything but disastrous for the local community of Churwell. Surely the extra traffic would bring the Outer Leeds Ring-road to a halt. If you are not of the same opinion please write to me and convince me otherwise.

Schools; Churwell Primary School is 2-form and is full. Local residents are being turned away as it is. The proposed building will be nearer to the school enabling them to gain priority above many of the current local residents. Increasing CPS to 3-form would bring capacity for 360 children. A number that now where near meets the needs of 1,248 houses. Is LCC prepared to build a school with the infrastructure to cope with the influx? Our 3 High Schools are also at capacity. Are you planning on building a new High School as Well?

Doctors & Dentists; There is no dentist in Churwell and only 1 Doctors Surgery. Dentists in Morley are full and most only take new private patients. This is the situation now and if there is no new infrastructure along with the new housing then it will become very difficult in Churwell and Morley to obtain the basic essentials for healthy living.

Access; The roads to the proposed sites are already under pressure of traffic, indeed on some access roads the traffic is reduced to single file because of cars parked outside domestic property. Churwell New Village is appalling re the way car-parking was under calculated by the Developers and approved by Leeds City Council. It is impossible to drive a vehicle along some streets as the roads are congested with parked cars owned by the residents. How is access to be guaranteed to the new housing when it will have to travel on these congested roads?

Loss of Green Space; Site 1282 is the only green-space which separates Churwell from Morley's suburbs. These field are presently farmed and have public footpaths for access into this small bit of countryside. The area is well used by the local residents of Churwell and Morley. It is inconceivable that you wish to remove this asset and merge Churwell into Morley by filling this much appreciated green-space with housing.

Site 2125 was last year the subject of a 'Village Green' application and supported by letters of over 150 local residents in support of this application. These applications came for people who had roamed freely over this land for more than 20 years. There were as many applications submitted by people who had roamed for less than 20 years. If you read the Inspectors report the failure of this application was on a technicality and not because it was found that people had not and do not use this land for recreational purposes. Your proposals will fill this land with unnecessary housing and remove the last remnants of land where our children can get outside and observe the flora and fauna in our local community.

Brownfield Sites; Leeds has enough brownfield sites in which to start building the housing numbers recommended in the LDF. Make the Property Developers use this not the easier and cheaper green spaces they are lobbying hard to use.

Twenty years ago I had the choice to live and work in Leeds or Manchester. I chose Leeds because it had a vision and integrity towards its building plans, leaving spaces between the various localities, which gives a sense of space and a feeling of belonging to an individual area.

Manchester's rambling urban sprawl, where you have no idea what town you are in let alone what area of Manchester sent a shudder down my spine.

Please, please don't turn Leeds into the same endless urban environment by allowing mass housing to be built on small green-space between the existing local areas. I will not be the only person who, considering where to live will feel Leeds has a unique balance.

I know you have to have a vision to improve Leeds. You also have a responsibility not to spoil it for the generations to come.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: Wenda P Whitehead

Representor No: PRS00312

Representation ID: REP04786 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Representation ID: REP02254 Question Ref: H1

Referring to the LDF sites in the Morley area I would like to present my objections as follows:-

The Green areas:-

Site 1282 - Laneside Farm (suggested capacity 542 houses).

Site 2125 - Manor House Farm (suggested capacity 77 houses).

Objection to the above because of the situations regarding:-

SCHOOLS - For many years now we have had problems finding places for our children in Morley/Churwell schools. After discussions with the Education Department we did manage to obtain an additional class intake at Asquith School but all other schools are full to capacity with no more room for extra classes or extensions. Can you find money to build new schools or areas to put them?

TRAFFIC — Elland Road is the main road to Leeds from Morley and is already "nose to tail" during the rush hour every day. It is used often by Ambulances, Police, etc. during these periods which does often cause problems it being a narrow road with bends and narrow pavements through a built up area. I personally have had three vehicles into my fence/wall.

FACILITIES — Dentists/Doctors. These facilities already have problems with the local Doctors very often being unable to offer appointments in less than a week.

We are already really worried about the extra problems the Daisy Hill development will cause without adding the unbelievable numbers of housing to an already saturated area.

I sincerely trust you will give the above comments your consideration and look at this matter in a sensible way by transferring ALL OF THESE SITES TO RED.

Representation ID: REP02254 Question Ref: H4

Referring to the LDF sites in the Morley area I would like to present my objections as follows:-

The Green areas:-

Site 1282 - Laneside Farm (suggested capacity 542 houses).

Site 2125 - Manor House Farm (suggested capacity 77 houses).

Objection to the above because of the situations regarding:-

SCHOOLS - For many years now we have had problems finding places for our children in Morley/Churwell schools. After discussions with the Education Department we did manage to obtain an additional class intake at Asquith School but all other schools are full to capacity with no more room for extra classes or extensions. Can you find money to build new schools or areas to put them?

TRAFFIC — Elland Road is the main road to Leeds from Morley and is already "nose to tail" during the rush hour every day. It is used often by Ambulances, Police, etc. during these periods which does often cause problems it being a narrow road with bends and narrow pavements through a built up area. I personally have had three vehicles into my fence/wall.

FACILITIES — Dentists/Doctors. These facilities already have problems with the local Doctors very often being unable to offer appointments in less than a week.

We are already really worried about the extra problems the Daisy Hill development will cause without adding the unbelievable numbers of housing to an already saturated area.

I sincerely trust you will give the above comments your consideration and look at this matter in a sensible way by transferring ALL OF THESE SITES TO RED.

Name: Rodney Britton

Representor No: PRS00334

Representation ID: REP02261 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Manor House Farm

Green to Red

In Green Belt

Local amenities full, increased traffic congestion.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: Lee Crossland

Representor No: PRS00361

Representation ID: REP02305 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Manor House Farm

Green to Red

Full capacity of are area and no allotments - to be used for new housing as these have been part of our heritage.

Name: Catherine Halloran

Representor No: PRS00364

Representation ID: REP02307 Question Ref: H1

2125 -

Name: C Monk

Representor No: PRS00389

Representation ID: REP02329 Question Ref: H1

2125. Green to red. Traffic is horrendous morning and night on Churwell Hill and surrounding areas - queues from Dry Salters all the way up Churwell Hill - more housing is just a joke - no way. Churwell is already like a lego village with houses everywhere. Why do we need even more? Cannot believe its even being considered!

Name: Susan Williams

Representor No: PRS00396

Representation ID: REP02339 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Manor House Farm - Green to Red

Site not considered suitable for additional housing. Keep Green spaces.

Local infrastructure cannot support additional housing. Further loss of valuable habitats.

Name: Claire Williams

Representor No: PRS00397

Representation ID: REP02340 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House Farm - Green to Red

Site not considered suitable for additional housing. Keep green spaces.

Local infrastructure cannot support additional housing. Further loss of valuable habitats.

Name: Lynne Senior

Representor No: PRS00399

Representation ID: REP02343 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Green to red. Too much traffic around Churwell Hill (dangerous around Churwell School and Cottingley). Not enough doctors/dentists in the Morley area. Morley is getting completely joined up to Leeds (Beeston area). Why not pick North Leeds/Garforth for areas plenty of fields to build on?

Name: David Williams

Representor No: PRS00401

Representation ID: REP02344 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House Farm - Green to Red

Site not considered suitable for new housing. Keep green spaces.

Local infrastructure cannot support additional housing. Further loss of valuable green spaces.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: Dean Frank

Representor No: PRS00402

Representation ID: REP02347 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House Farm - Green to Red

Site not considered suitable for new housing. Keep green spaces.

Local infrastructure cannot support additional housing. Further loss of valuable green spaces.

Name: A Thorpe

Representor No: PRS00409

Representation ID: REP02353 Question Ref: H1

2125 Monor House Farm - Green to Red

In Green Belt and now used to grow food.

These allotments are needed more now due to the rising cost of food.

Name: T Thorpe

Representor No: PRS00414

Representation ID: REP02356 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House Farm

Green Belt and the allotments are needed to enable people to grow their own food.

Name: E Bard

Representor No: PRS00419

Representation ID: REP02358 Question Ref: H1

2125. Green to red. Very high traffic in peak hours.

Name: Carl Bridgman

Representor No: PRS00427

Representation ID: REP02372 Question Ref: H1

2125

Name: Benjamin Helm

Representor No: PRS00430

Representation ID: REP02375 Question Ref: H1

2125 - green to red. Access to main roads difficult plus Churwell can't cope with increased traffic.

Name: Patricia Brown

Representor No: PRS00431

Representation ID: REP02377 Question Ref: H1

2125 - green to red. Green belt. Ruination of open spaces. Nowhere to breathe fresh air. No dog places. No places in schools. Roads congested - complete log jam.

Name: J Thompson

Representor No: PRS00433

Representation ID: REP02378 Question Ref: H1

2125 - green to red. Lack of infrastructure to accommodate extra housing.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: Ivy Shelton

Representor No: PRS00435

Representation ID: REP02380 Question Ref: H1

2125 - green to red. Stay green enough housing already. No school places, doctors and dentist full, road full of traffic.

Name: S Ellis

Representor No: PRS00436

Representation ID: REP02381 Question Ref: H1

2125 - green to red. Must be a better site somewhere. Access will be difficult.

Name: Shirley Smith

Representor No: PRS00437

Representation ID: REP02383 Question Ref: H1

2125 - change to red. No more houses in Churwell. Roads and schools cannot cope. No doctors no dentist. Take new houses to nort Leeds!

Name: Bessie Jackson

Representor No: PRS00438

Representation ID: REP02382 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Green to red.

Churwell cannot cope with all this building. Our children cannot obtain school places now! Traffic congestion is a problem. Local facilities also a problem - doctors, dentists etc.

Name: Jeff Smith

Representor No: PRS00439

Representation ID: REP02385 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Churwell is a village and should stay a village. We are already up to capacity for schools and doctors. Roads already too busy.

Name: Peter Marshmont

Representor No: PRS00440

Representation ID: REP02384 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Green to red.

The only allotments I am aware of are behind Manor Farm Drive. This area has been used as allotments for the last 40/50 years - why change?

Name: Janice Beever

Representor No: PRS00441

Representation ID: REP04791 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North
This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Representation ID: REP02386 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Doctors, dentist and schools are all working at full capacity with the residents already living in Churwell. The traffic and public transport is extremely busy at peak times. Churwell has already doubled in size over the last few years - with no extra facilities - any further development will destroy the village identity - it's unacceptable. Doctors, dentist and schools are all working at full capacity with the residents already living in Churwell. The traffic and public transport is extremely busy at peak times. Churwell has already doubled in size over the last few years - with no extra facilities - any further development will destroy the village identity - it's unacceptable.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: Deborah Ingham

Representor No: PRS00442

Representation ID: REP02388 Question Ref: H1

2125 - No room in our doctors. No room in our dentists. Not enough places in our school. There is no room for the above for residents who already live in Churwell. There is only one road through Churwell and this is already overflowing and the road is in need of work, more traffic will cause more congestion and damage to the road surface.

Name: Jessica Croft

Representor No: PRS00443

Representation ID: REP02389 Question Ref: H1

2125 - The area will not uphold any more houses and individuals and I believe schools, doctors and roads will be hugely affected.

Name: Paul Haylings

Representor No: PRS00444

Representation ID: REP02391 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Schools are already overcrowded, would make traffic even worse, would drive prices of houses down in the area.

Name: Ian Thomas

Representor No: PRS00445

Representation ID: REP02390 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Green to red.

In Green Belt. Ruination of what bit of green open space remains. Congested roads, congested doctors surgeries.

Name: Dennis Smith

Representor No: PRS00453

Representation ID: REP02400 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Not enough schools, no policing, not enough doctors, road cannot take more traffic.

Name: William Lee

Representor No: PRS00454

Representation ID: REP02402 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Churwell isn't a village anymore. My back garden looked on to field belonging to a farm. On the plans before building houses my back garden didn't show a gable end facing my garden. Enough is enough.

Name: Freda Lee

Representor No: PRS00455

Representation ID: REP02403 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Churwell has taken too many new houses that we are getting overcrowded. Schools can't cope, doctors can't cope.

Name: Jatinder Singh Mann

Representor No: PRS00457

Representation ID: REP02401 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House Farm - Green to Red

Traffic in Churwell is already at a standstill at rush hour/peak times. It cannot take any more without major problems for locals. This will also affect schooling as my neighbour has had problems obtaining a place at Churwell Primary School for his son - this is a scandal!! hope to start a family in the future and do not wish to as my neighbour has been forced to do.

It goes without saying that all areas will be at breaking point with the extra pressure. As a taxpayer I would be grateful if you do not develop on the little bit of green we have left in this area. Britain was a sign of fortitude but has become a one trick pony. First the bubble burst in housing a few years ago and still you don't seem to get the message.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: Garry Tottie

Representor No: PRS00459

Representation ID: REP02407 Question Ref: H1

2125 - green to red.

Name: D P Willerton

Representor No: PRS00468

Representation ID: REP02409 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House Farm - Green to Red

Not enough amenities

We were promised a new school in Churwell when the Churwell Village site was passed - it never happened.

Name: Terence Dawson

Representor No: PRS00471

Representation ID: REP02419 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Green to red.

Doctors health centres and dentist lists full. All arterial roads in the area already at full capacity. More traffic could bring the area to complete stand still.

Name: Marjorie Beevers

Representor No: PRS00476

Representation ID: REP02424 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Green to red.

Too many cars on road already. Not enough schools, doctors etc.

Name: I Holdsworth

Representor No: PRS00480

Representation ID: REP02425 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Green to red. Lack of basic essential infrastructure in the area. No school places, doctors/dentists working at full capacity. Traffic congestion. Loss of village character.

Name: J Hudson

Representor No: PRS00484

Representation ID: REP02430 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Green to red. Lack of basic essential infrastructure in the area. No school places, doctors/dentists working at full capacity. Traffic congestion.

Name: Claire Hall

Representor No: PRS00486

Representation ID: REP02434 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Green to red. Churwell has its share of housing development now ie. New village . This area is recreational for locals - allotments, dog walkers.

Name: Jayne Gelder

Representor No: PRS00489

Representation ID: REP02436 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Green to red. Lack of basic essential infrastructure in the area. Not enough school places, doctors and dentists. Traffic congestion.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: C Eastwood

Representor No: PRS00490

Representation ID: REP02438 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Green to red. Already enough traffic/congestion on Elland Road/Churwell Hill. Schools struggling now to give places to children. Doctors surgeries full to capacity. Waste disposal cannot cope, sewage problems.

Name: Margaret Bailey

Representor No: PRS00506

Representation ID: REP02453 Question Ref: H1

2125

Name: Anita Doherty

Representor No: PRS00507

Representation ID: REP02454 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Green to red. Will spoil our rural walks through there, traffic congestion already high at peak times. Currently places of nature , saw lots of cocoons of a black moth with red spots this year. Takes me days to get a doctors appointment!

Name: Barbara Walker

Representor No: PRS00508

Representation ID: REP02458 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Green to red. Stop taking farmland. We lost Daisy Hill, 99 houses to be built, no more open space, 2 cars to each house. You didn't listen then. Listen now.

Name: Billy Commons

Representor No: PRS00509

Representation ID: REP02907 Question Ref: H1

Site 1282/2125 Green to Red
Site1220A/1099A/1099B/1996(assume 1096) Amber to Red

No School Places
Traffic going to be grid locked
No room in doctors or dentists

Representation ID: REP02456 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House Farm Green to Red
Churwell will be grid locked at peak times

Name: Nancy Cockerham

Representor No: PRS00511

Representation ID: REP02459 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Green to red. Only green space between Manor Farm and Hepworths, a breather from the motorway.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: Heather Moynihan

Representor No: PRS00513

Representation ID: REP02462 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Green to red.

No more houses in Churwell!

- 1) Churwell has already over a sustained period of time undergone a major development in the building of houses. The infrastructure in the area cannot cope with any more.
- 2) I have lived in Morley all my life and we know that school places are already at a premium and as a we still only have the same 3 senior schools that were here 45 years ago when I started.
- 3) Churwell Hill is extremely busy and will only get busier if further homes are built and become more dangerous.
- 4) Doctors and dentists will not be able to cope.
- 5) Is Morley to be totally devoid of any green, recreational land for people to enjoy?
- 6) What about North Leeds being used for the building of more houses!!

Name: Karen Smith

Representor No: PRS00514

Representation ID: REP02460 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House Farm - Green to Red

Traffic too busy. Churwell will lose its character. Need some open land without housing - too congested as it is.

Name: D Telford

Representor No: PRS00517

Representation ID: REP02466 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Green to red.

Infrastructure cannot take all these extra houses. Schools cannot take the children now! Traffic is congested already. Lack of facilities - i.e. doctor, dentists etc.

Name: Derek Metcalf

Representor No: PRS00523

Representation ID: REP02387 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Green to red.

Schools already full - dentists and doctors full. Traffic congestion already a problem, many houses in area still for sale.

Name: Adele Metcalf

Representor No: PRS00525

Representation ID: REP02392 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Green to red. Schools already full, dentists and doctors full. Traffic congestion already a problem, many houses in area still for sale.

Name: Connie Lunn

Representor No: PRS00573

Representation ID: REP02530 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm - Green to Red

2125 Manor House Farm - Green to Red

1220A, 1099A, 1099B, 1096 (Assumed - 1996 on form) - Amber to Red

School cannot accommodate more children, traffic already congested during peak hours, lack of local facilities (doctors, dentists).

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: J Telford

Representor No: PRS00575

Representation ID: REP02532 Question Ref: H1

1282 Laneside Farm - Green to Red
2125 Manor House Farm - Green to Red
1220A, 1099A, 1099B, 1096 (Assumed - 1996 on form) - Amber to Red
No School places, traffic congestion, infrastructure. Lack of doctors and dentists who are already full.

Name: Brian Georgehow

Representor No: PRS00576

Representation ID: REP02533 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House Farm
No more houses on any Churwell sites. Full to the brim.

Name: Eric Newton

Representor No: PRS00577

Representation ID: REP05334 Question Ref: H1

As residents of Churwell, we are writing with regard to the proposed housing development sites within our local community. We all share the boundary of one of the sites in question, Site 1220A 'Land East of Churwell', and are particularly concerned over any possible proposal to build in this location. We understand this is currently classified as 'Amber: Sites which have potential but issues / not as favoured as green sites'. As clearly some of the issues have already been identified, we would like to re-iterate and clarify some of the issues that are of greatest concern to us as residents immediately neighbouring this location. Churwell Hill / Elland Road is the main road from Morley towards Leeds, and as such suffers from a very high volume of traffic, particularly at commuting hours, when the traffic is at standstill to and from the Ring Road. This road does not have the ability to cope with greater volumes of traffic passing through the area, without creating greater risks to safety (cyclists, pedestrians, drivers) and increased congestion. This has already been identified as an issue as there are a number of speed cameras within a short space along this road. This particular site, lies next to a busy train line, again posing dangers to locals, as it is not unusual for us to see people walking next to or crossing over the train line. This risk would only increase with additional housing in the area. Additionally, we understand the site has been identified as a historical land-fill area, again highlighting unsuitability. Regarding the 6 sites identified in Churwell overall, the general infrastructure within the village is not of a scale that could accommodate such volumes of new houses, schools, doctors, dentists, and services in general would not be able to take on a new influx of residents. Based on these, and other points, we strongly support the re-classification of this area (Site 1220A), and the other proposed Churwell sites, to colour code 'Red: Sites not considered suitable for allocation of housing'. Instead, we would ask the Planning Department to look at the areas within Leeds City Council that already have planning permission, and also, to revitalise housing currently standing empty, rather than look to build on Greenfield areas.

Name: Josephine M Barton

Representor No: PRS00578

Representation ID: REP02535 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor Farm. Green Farm

Extra Housing is illogical in this area and already many houses for sale and brown site areas to fill. Schools full and local facilities would be a problem - doctors - dentists - etc.

Name: Jim Miller

Representor No: PRS00579

Representation ID: REP02537 Question Ref: H1

2125. Manor House Farm. Green to Red.

Green Belt find another better suited. Takes toll on whole Churwell infrastructure, ie excess traffic, schools, doctors.

Name: Carol Lynne Weldon

Representor No: PRS00596

Representation ID: REP02579 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House Farm. Green to Red.

Allotments needed. Should be more available. All greenbelt land should remain so use brownfield sites (OCD Warehousing)

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: L A Smith

Representor No: PRS00655

Representation ID: REP02642 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor Farm. Red. Red.

The only piece of greenland between Hepworths and Manor Farm Drive before the impact of noise from Motorway.

Name: Linda Georgeson

Representor No: PRS00657

Representation ID: REP02644 Question Ref: H1

2125.Manor House Farm.

Churwell Hill is already a very busy road especially at peak tiomes - cannot take much more - and cannot be widened. Busy road - no pl;aces available at doctors/dentists/schools - Unless more are also planned.

Name: Ward

Representor No: PRS00709

Representation ID: REP02711 Question Ref: H4

1282 / 2125 – Change to red for the following reasons:

- The increase in traffic in the area – many on Churwell Hill, has already increased from the opening of Tesco.
- The increase in children trying to find a school nearby. It was bad enough 15 years ago when we had to find alternative schools.
- Living in the middle of an over populated area – estate after estate, after estate – causing an increase in crime
- How long will be waiting for doctors / dentists etc
- Massive traffic increase – since Churwell new village, Churwell is a traffic jam now instead of what it was – a quiet village.

Name: Trevor Wilson

Representor No: PRS00711

Representation ID: REP02713 Question Ref: H1

1282 / 2125 – Change to red for the following reasons:

Too much congestion in this area already, both from housing and transport and not enough school places for children already in the Churwell area.

Name: Nicholas Turton

Representor No: PRS00714

Representation ID: REP02717 Question Ref: H1

1282 / 2125 - Change to red for the following reasons:

- Schools have only room to take children already living in the area.
- Doctors and dentists are at full capacity.
- Heavy traffic congestion at peak times.
- Churwell will become completely joined to Morley and loose village character.

Name: Hazel Holdsworth

Representor No: PRS00848

Representation ID: REP02864 Question Ref: H1

Site 1282/2125 Green to Red

Site1220A/1099A/1099B/1996(assume 1096) Amber to Red

Schools full
No dentist
No doctors. Have to go to Beeston
Poor Bus Service
Need More Crossings

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: E Johnson

Representor No: PRS00849

Representation ID: REP02865 Question Ref: H1

Site 1282/2125 Green to Red

Site1220A/1099A/1099B/1996(assume 1096) Amber to Red

No schools for children - No doctors or dentists. Too much traffic on Elland Road - Cannot get across for traffic.

Name: Andrea Clarkson

Representor No: PRS00850

Representation ID: REP02866 Question Ref: H1

Site 1282/2125 Green to Red

Site1220A/1099A/1099B/1996(assume 1096) Amber to Red

The traffic is bad enough already. No school places for local children would need more school. Doctors appointments or should I say getting one is hard enough already.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: A C E Lister

Representor No: PRS00851

Representation ID: REP08303 Question Ref: H1

1282 / 2125 -

I wish to object to the above plans for the following reasons:-

Do the members of the Leeds City Planning Dept. actually care about the people who live in or around the sites they plan to develop, or do they only see increased council tax revenues. If they lived in the areas affected by the above proposals they would certainly think again.

The plan to also build several hundred houses on Daisy Hill will cause many traffic problems at the top of King George Ave, Croft House Road, and New Bank Street. These roads all come out onto Elland Road or roads connecting at the top of Churwell Hill. From St Peters Church all the way through Churwell to the roundabout near the Dry Salter's Arms it is one long traffic jam every morning and every evening. It takes at least 30-45 mins to cover 1 1/2 miles and then another 30-45 mins to actually get into Leeds. Throughout the day Elland Road up through Churwell is a busy road.

Upwards of 1500 houses are planned on all sites, on today average of 1.5 cars per household that will mean another 2250 cars from King George Ave, Sandmead Close, Westwood Side, Harwell Ave, and New Village Way all coming out onto Elland Road in the Churwell area. Elland Road can't cope with the present traffic, without this increased volume. Or have the planners requested that the developers put new roads in these areas so traffic is diverted away from Elland Road.

Also what about the basic infrastructure of the area schools, shops, community centres, environmental issues etc. have any of these been looked at? Or do the planners only see £ signs, over the past 40 years Churwell/Morley has had more than its share of house building, and it's about time Leeds Council looked elsewhere to raise money.

Sincerely trust you will give the above comments your consideration and look at this matter in a sensible way by transferring ALL OF THESE SITES TO RED.

Representation ID: REP02867 Question Ref: H4

1282 / 2125 -

Re: LDF SITES IN MORLEY

The Green areas:-

Site 1282 - Laneside Farm (suggested capacity 542 houses).

Site 2125- Manor House Farm (Pit Hill & Allotments)(suggested capacity 77 houses).

I wish to object to the above plans for the following reasons:-

Do the members of the Leeds City Planning Dept. actually care about the people who live in or around the sites they plan to develop, or do they only see increased council tax revenues. If they lived in the areas affected by the above proposals they would certainly think again.

The plan to also build several hundred houses on Daisy Hill will cause many traffic problems at the top of King George Ave, Croft House Road, and New Bank Street. These roads all come out onto Elland Road or roads connecting at the top of Churwell Hill. From St Peters Church all the way through Churwell to the roundabout near the Dry Salter's Arms it is one long traffic jam every morning and every evening. It takes at least 30-45 mins to cover 1 1/2 miles and then another 30-45 mins to actually get into Leeds. Throughout the day Elland Road up through Churwell is a busy road.

Upwards of 1500 houses are planned on all sites, on today average of 1.5 cars per household that will mean another 2250 cars from King George Ave, Sandmead Close, Westwood Side, Harwell Ave, and New Village Way all coming out onto Elland Road in the Churwell area. Elland Road can't cope with the present traffic, without this increased volume. Or have the planners requested that the developers put new roads in these areas so traffic is diverted away from Elland Road.

Also what about the basic infrastructure of the area schools, shops, community centres, environmental issues etc. have any of these been looked at? Or do the planners only see £ signs, over the past 40 years Churwell/Morley has had more than its share of house building, and it's about time Leeds Council looked elsewhere to raise money.

Sincerely trust you will give the above comments your consideration and look at this matter in a sensible way by transferring ALL OF THESE SITES TO RED.

Name: Betty Wilson

Representor No: PRS00855

Representation ID: REP02871 Question Ref: H1

Sites 1282 and 2125

I would like the above changed to red. I wish to object to the LDF plans for the following reasons: Too much congestion in this area both for housing and transport and not enough school spaces for children already in the Churwell area.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: Tiffany Sturdy

Representor No: PRS00857

Representation ID: REP02873 Question Ref: H1

There is a limited amount of school placements and childcare in the area and most are running to their full capacity. Doctors and dentists are also limited on new patients. There is already heavy traffic congestion at peak times and more homes would add to this problem. These developments would reduce the already limited amount of outdoor open areas available to residents.

Name: Paul Kirk

Representor No: PRS00884

Representation ID: REP02905 Question Ref: H1

Site 1282/2125 Green to Red
Site1220A/1099A/1099B/1996(assume 1096) Amber to Red

The traffic already horrendous on Churwell hill and there is a waiting list for the dentist. There has been a lot of building in this area with the addition of Churwell New Village and the area is bursting at the seams.

Name: Margery Kirk

Representor No: PRS00885

Representation ID: REP02906 Question Ref: H1

Site 1282/2125 Green to Red
Site1220A/1099A/1099B/1996(assume 1096) Amber to Red

It would alter the whole infrastructure. The traffic congestion is already a nightmare on Churwell Hill and Elland Road. The schools are full to capacity. Local children can't all get into the schools. Drs surgeries are full. You've all on to get an appointment. The waste collections will struggle to keep up regularity. The whole idea of Dore New Buildings in this area is totally ludicrous. THINK AGAIN. It will lose its village character.

Name: Lynne Bedford

Representor No: PRS00887

Representation ID: REP02908 Question Ref: H1

Site 1282/2125 Green to Red
Site1220A/1099A/1099B/1996(assume 1096) Amber to Red

We already have no school places for children actually living in Churwell. Plus the road congestion since New Village was built has doubled and there are more houses being built on Daisy Hill.

Name: Anthony Holmes

Representor No: PRS00889

Representation ID: REP02910 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Manor House Farm, Green to Red, Green Field Site, High volume of traffic churwell will lose its village status.

Name: Marie Henderson

Representor No: PRS00890

Representation ID: REP03304 Question Ref: H1

2125 ManorHouse Farm, Green to Red.

Name: H.j Bilton

Representor No: PRS00904

Representation ID: REP02933 Question Ref: H1

1282 / 2125 - Amber to Red, Schools have only room to take children already living in the area no spare capacity. Churwell Hill (Elland Road) is the only road into Leeds and afraid heavy traffic at peaktimes will make getting onto Elland Road impossible. Churwell will become joined up to Morley and will lose its long held village character. Doctors and Dentists working at full capacity. Infrastructure not sufficient for so many new houses to be built.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: John Bilton

Representor No: PRS00907

Representation ID: REP02934 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Manor House Farm

1)Infrastructure not sufficient for so many hous. 2) Schools are full and have no spare capac .3)Elland Road struggles to cope at peak times now & with more houses would be impossible.4)With more housing Churwell would join up with Morley and loose its village character. 5)Doctors & Dentists already full capacity.

Name: Elaine Fletcher

Representor No: PRS00913

Representation ID: REP02942 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Manor House farm. Green to Red

We have already lost the majority of all rural/open land. Peak period traffic is already at an unacceptable delay level on churwell hill.

Name: P S Barrie

Representor No: PRS00915

Representation ID: REP04781 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Representation ID: REP04810 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Representation ID: REP04769 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: A P O'Brien

Representor No: PRS01057

Representation ID: REP03117 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House Farm - Green to Red

Another Green Belt area. If built upon is there going to be any green left in Churwell?

If this site is built upon the road network will be choked? There is not enough infrastructure to cope with additional housing. Also where are all the children going to be schooled? Not enough schools at the moment.

Name: A.J. Ellis

Representor No: PRS01080

Representation ID: REP03145 Question Ref: H1

Site 1282/2125 Green to Red

Site1220A/1099A/1099B/1996(assume 1096) Amber to Red

1/ Roads alrady congested

2/Insufficient school places

3/Medical services already at full capacity

4/The traffic pollution on Churwell Hill between 7:30 and 9:00am is very bad.

Name: Lynne Paul

Representor No: PRS01169

Representation ID: REP04800 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: Angela Horsfall

Representor No: PRS01174

Representation ID: REP03272 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Manor House Farm. Green to Red. This area is already oversubscribed in comparison to the service available. Congestion on local roads, no places for our children in the nearest schools, doctors and dentist surgeries!!!

Name: P Britland

Representor No: PRS01176

Representation ID: REP03274 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Manor House Farm. Green to Red. Infrastructure, Dentists, Schools, Roads Heavy Traffic, Schools, Doctors, Dentists already full. Use Brownfield sites.

Name: K Fielden

Representor No: PRS01179

Representation ID: REP03278 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Manor House Farm. Green to Red. Roads infrastructures, schools, dentists. Roads congested. Trains full (I am a regular passenger on trains for work). HORRENDOUS!!! Morley already full - surley there are enough brown field sites.

Name: D Paul

Representor No: PRS01183

Representation ID: REP04793 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North
This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Audrey Hippey

Representor No: PRS01200

Representation ID: REP03298 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House Farm. Green to Red. Morley can already not support traffic, Morley ha swaiting lists for places in schools. Does not need more residents.

Name: David Woods

Representor No: PRS01201

Representation ID: REP03300 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Green to Red Manor House Farm. Plenty of Brownfield sites In and around Morley use those !!Entry and Egress for 100+ vehicles along williams street or manor farm drive will cause chaos.

Name: K Fryer

Representor No: PRS01445

Representation ID: REP03576 Question Ref: H1

2125 green to red. Schools not big enough. Too much traffic. No wildlife and open space left.

Name: John Hallagan

Representor No: PRS01455

Representation ID: REP03588 Question Ref: H1

2125 – green to red.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: Katherine Davies

Representor No: PRS01514

Representation ID: REP05332 Question Ref: H1

As residents of Churwell, we are writing with regard to the proposed housing development sites within our local community. We all share the boundary of one of the sites in question, Site 1220A 'Land East of Churwell', and are particularly concerned over any possible proposal to build in this location. We understand this is currently classified as 'Amber: Sites which have potential but issues / not as favoured as green sites'. As clearly some of the issues have already been identified, we would like to re-iterate and clarify some of the issues that are of greatest concern to us as residents immediately neighbouring this location. Churwell Hill / Elland Road is the main road from Morley towards Leeds, and as such suffers from a very high volume of traffic, particularly at commuting hours, when the traffic is at standstill to and from the Ring Road. This road does not have the ability to cope with greater volumes of traffic passing through the area, without creating greater risks to safety (cyclists, pedestrians, drivers) and increased congestion. This has already been identified as an issue as there are a number of speed cameras within a short space along this road. This particular site, lies next to a busy train line, again posing dangers to locals, as it is not unusual for us to see people walking next to or crossing over the train line. This risk would only increase with additional housing in the area. Additionally, we understand the site has been identified as a historical land-fill area, again highlighting unsuitability. Regarding the 6 sites identified in Churwell overall, the general infrastructure within the village is not of a scale that could accommodate such volumes of new houses, schools, doctors, dentists, and services in general would not be able to take on a new influx of residents. Based on these, and other points, we strongly support the re-classification of this area (Site 1220A), and the other proposed Churwell sites, to colour code 'Red: Sites not considered suitable for allocation of housing'. Instead, we would ask the Planning Department to look at the areas within Leeds City Council that already have planning permission, and also, to revitalise housing currently standing empty, rather than look to build on Greenfield areas.

Name: Nora Ellis

Representor No: PRS01517

Representation ID: REP03659 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House Farm

Name: Sarah Kate Linden

Representor No: PRS01524

Representation ID: REP03663 Question Ref: H1

2125 Green to Red. Schools dentists, roads infrastructure, roads congested can't access hospitals etc schools full doctor's dentists full. Morley full to capacity use brownfield sites.

Name: Wilfred Parker

Representor No: PRS01527

Representation ID: REP03668 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House Farm. Green to Red. Very congested area already, schools, dentists etc. Roads almost impassable. Morley town full. Taking green fields is immoral.

Name: I Stephens

Representor No: PRS01545

Representation ID: REP03686 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House Farm Green to Red. Houses planned very large overlooking bungalow. Traffic pollution.

Name: Kenneth Linley

Representor No: PRS01550

Representation ID: REP03693 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House Farm Green to Red. The school is already oversubscribed and some Churwell children cannot get places in Churwell School. There is only one GP sub-surgery for the whole of Churwell and already hundreds of houses have been built here in the last few years this has also impacted on the volume of traffic going to and from Leeds. The existing main road cannot cope with this high volume now.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: Keith Wahelin

Representor No: PRS01557

Representation ID: REP03700 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House Farm Green to Red. Too much traffic, schools not big enough, wildlife & open space.

Name: Jane Bellwood

Representor No: PRS01593

Representation ID: REP08302 Question Ref: H4

1282 / 2125 -

I wish to object to the above plans for the following reasons:-

Some of the sites are on green belt land such as 1282— Laneside Farm. I think it is important to preserve some green spaces locally as once they are built on, they will be lost forever!

The 1282 Laneside Farm and 2125 Manor House Farm sites in particular separate Churwell from Morley which helps Churwell retain its village character. The same can be said for all sites as they are all bordering Churwell.

Local Schools cannot cope with the number of children currently enrolling into them. My son started Churwell School in 2012 at which there were 85 applicants for only 60 places in the reception year. Some Churwell children were allocated places outside the area in Beeston, etc. Other Schools in Morley similarly had greater numbers of applications than places resulting in an extra class having to be run in Asquith School, Morley. The numbers of houses proposed for the area will obviously mean that there would be a huge increase in children in the area which will affect both primary and high schools. Local councillors/MPs are campaigning for Churwell children to be offered places at Churwell Schools and also Morley children to be offered a place at a Morley school where it has been requested. Doctors and dentists are at capacity currently.

Such a massive development will have an impact on the roads. It is now 'the norm' for traffic to queue out of Churwell towards the ring road on a morning and for a slow crawl of traffic back up through Churwell in the evening rush hour. Not only would extra traffic inconvenience road users further, but I think pollution increases should be looked into too.

Finally, I am aware that these developments have been publicised and that there is a lot of local opposition to them. Please remember that the council is run to represent the community and allowing unsustainable levels of house building such as these is against the vast majority of the public's wishes. I would suggest visiting Churwell to conduct a survey to assess opinion of the public. Please side with the Leeds communities rather than the national house builders.

I sincerely trust you will give the above comments your consideration and look at this matter in a sensible way by transferring ALL OF THESE SITES TO RED.

Name: B Stringer

Representor No: PRS01606

Representation ID: REP04797 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Representation ID: REP03758 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor house farm Churwell Green top Red. Lack of infrastructure in area more traffic congestion no school places, doctors, dentists, all working at full capacity.

Name: L.e Beever

Representor No: PRS01607

Representation ID: REP04804 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Representation ID: REP03759 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House Farm, Churwell. Green to Red. Lack of basic essential infrastructure in the area. No school places, Dr's/Dentists working at full capacity, traffic congestion, loss of village character.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: Paula Pearce

Representor No: PRS01609

Representation ID: REP03761 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House Farm

Name: Jennie Megson

Representor No: PRS01610

Representation ID: REP03762 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House Farm Green to Red. In green belt. Increase in traffic on surrounding roads/no space at local schools for increase in children and for Churwells population.

Name: Reece Parker

Representor No: PRS01614

Representation ID: REP03765 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Green to Red. Not enough schools and doctors. All of the allotments are in full use. I fully appreciate the need for housing as we have a desperate shortage. Too many were sold off 15-20 years ago. My biggest objection is the traffic congestion. It takes me a long time to get to work. It is very busy at the White Rose at Xmas time and almost impossible when Leeds United Play at Elland Road. There is even the possibility of a future park and ride system nearby which if given permission to go ahead will cause further traffic problems.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: Colin McNab

Representor No: PRS01920

Representation ID: REP08301 Question Ref: H1

1282 / 2125 -

I wish to object to the above plans for the following reasons:-

The above areas represent a green area that provides access to the Countryside in Urban Morley, Churwell New Village and Churwell.

Observation of bats, kingfisher, ducks and swifts. Much is made of supposed plentiful green sites but when we take away local green space, we can't get it back.

Proposed housing would require heavy vehicle traffic to gain access. Since New Village Way has a preponderance of town houses and flats, many cars are parked on both sides of the road, limiting access via this route. It is also relevant that children play on this and adjoining streets, making the addition of Heavy vehicle through traffic an increased hazard.

The overgrown fields which lead up to Pit Hill and the ground between the hill and the motorway have been grazed by tethered horses and ponies, since fixed by chain and tyres or stakes would indicate use by the travelling community.

The only other use for the land has been by local people walking dogs, sledging on the hill and children using the land for 'adventure'.

The areas house market has suffered greatly following the crash in the housing market in 2007. Persimmon sold property up to a value of 195000 and house prices have fallen to 151000 in the space of 6 years. Further house stock in this area would further devalue existing housing prices.

It was stated by Persimmon when specifically asked if any further construction was envisaged, which would detract from the current views and house prices, that no further construction was likely due to the presence of the existing farm and poor drainage of the land below it.

Poor drainage and the presence of a storm culvert through Churwell New Village would raise concerns about the risk of flooding due to an increase of housing in that area.

No one wants to see further development in their own area, myself included. I am surprised by the imbalance of the planned housing development which appears to be focussed on the South side of Leeds. Why is Morley so heavily placed in the current plan. As I understand over the last two decades there has been a heavy burden placed on South Leeds with a minor role for North Leeds. This current plan further adds to that burden. It is very important that a Balance is seen to be shown in Housing Planning in all areas of Leeds.

Sincerely trust you will give the above comments your consideration and look at this matter in a sensible way by transferring ALL OF THESE SITES TO RED.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: Colin McNab

Representor No: PRS01920

Representation ID: REP04097 Question Ref: H1

Re: LDF SITES IN MORLEY

The Green areas:-

Site 1282 - Laneside Farm (suggested capacity 542 houses).

Site 2125 - Manor House Farm (Pit Hill & Allotments)(suggested capacity 77 houses).

I wish to object to the above plans for the following reasons:-

The above areas represent a green area that provides access to the Countryside in Urban Morley, Churwell New Village and Churwell.

Observation of bats, kingfisher, ducks and swifts. Much is made of supposed plentiful green sites but when we take away local green space, we can't get it back.

Proposed housing would require heavy vehicle traffic to gain access. Since New Village Way has a preponderance of town houses and flats, many cars are parked on both sides of the road, limiting access via this route. It is also relevant that children play on this and adjoining streets, making the addition of Heavy vehicle through traffic an increased hazard.

The overgrown fields which lead up to Pit Hill and the ground between the hill and the motorway have been grazed by tethered horses and ponies, since fixed by chain and tyres or stakes would indicate use by the travelling community.

The only other use for the land has been by local people walking dogs, sledging on the hill and children using the land for 'adventure'.

The areas house market has suffered greatly following the crash in the housing market in 2007. Persimmon sold property up to a value of 195000 and house prices have fallen to 151000 in the space of 6 years. Further house stock in this area would further devalue existing housing prices.

It was stated by Persimmon when specifically asked if any further construction was envisaged, which would detract from the current views and house prices, that no further construction was likely due to the presence of the existing farm and poor drainage of the land below it.

Poor drainage and the presence of a storm culvert through Churwell New Village would raise concerns about the risk of flooding due to an increase of housing in that area.

No one wants to see further development in their own area, myself included. I am surprised by the imbalance of the planned housing development which appears to be focussed on the South side of Leeds. Why is Morley so heavily placed in the current plan. As I understand over the last two decades there has been a heavy burden placed on South Leeds with a minor role for North Leeds. This current plan further adds to that burden. It is very important that a Balance is seen to be shown in Housing Planning in all areas of Leeds.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: Colin McNab

Representor No: PRS01920

Representation ID: REP04167 Question Ref: H1

Re: LDF SITES IN MORLEY

The Green areas:-

Site 1282 - Laneside Farm (suggested capacity 542 houses).

Site 2125 - Manor House Farm (Pit Hill & Allotments)(suggested capacity 77 houses).

I wish to object to the above plans for the following reasons:-

The above areas represent a green area that provides access to the Countryside in Urban Morley, Churwell New Village and Churwell.

Observation of bats, kingfisher, ducks and swifts. Much is made of supposed plentiful green sites but when we take away local green space, we can't get it back.

The 2011 Census showed that there were 12000 empty properties in Leeds. I understand from discussions with Local Councillors that there are 21000 existing Planning permissions for houses around Leeds. Should we not make use of the existing empty properties and agreed housing applications before resorting to green areas.

I understand that Builders would prefer to build houses in green areas as the profit for them is greater. However the need for affordable housing and family sized homes would be more valuable to the housing pool. The reduced profits of affordable housing is more fitting in times of austerity. The Leeds City Council is not there to maximise profits for building companies.

The plan shows groups of houses but fails to show the infrastructure required to facilitate this. More school places, more GPs, dentists, parking spaces, roads and jobs. No discussions have occurred between planners and the Highways Agency to determine impact and solution to the added traffic to the road network. Roads are already under strain from the existing traffic.

The Churwell New Village is constantly choked with cars parked on the roads. The plan had houses very closely packed with narrow garages that struggle to fit the average family car. Households don't just have one car and this adds to the existing congestion.

Proposed housing would require heavy vehicle traffic to gain access. Since New Village Way has a preponderance of town houses and flats, many cars are parked on both sides of the road, limiting access via this route. It is also relevant that children play on this and adjoining streets, making the addition of Heavy vehicle through traffic an increased hazard.

The overgrown fields which lead up to Pit Hill and the ground between the hill and the motorway have been grazed by tethered horses and ponies, since fixed by chain and tyres or stakes would indicate use by the travelling community.

The only other use for the land has been by local people walking dogs, sledging on the hill and children using the land for 'adventure'.

The areas house market has suffered greatly following the crash in the housing market in 2007. Persimmon sold property up to a value of 195000 and house prices have fallen to 151000 in the space of 6 years. Further house stock in this area would further devalue existing housing prices.

It was stated by Persimmon when specifically asked if any further construction was envisaged, which would detract from the current views and house prices, that no further construction was likely due to the presence of the existing farm and poor drainage of the land below it.

Poor drainage and the presence of a storm culvert through Churwell New Village would raise concerns about the risk of flooding due to an increase of housing in that area.

No one wants to see further development in their own area, myself included. I am surprised by the imbalance of the planned housing development which appears to be focussed on the South side of Leeds. Why is Morley so heavily placed in the current plan. As I understand over the last two decades there has been a heavy burden placed on South Leeds with a minor role for North Leeds. This current plan further adds to that burden. It is very important that a Balance is seen to be shown in Housing Planning in all areas of Leeds.

I also note concern at the likely high speed train line that is to be routed to Leeds. As it will be from the South and West, Morley would again be faced with the greater disruption.

Sincerely trust you will give the above comments your consideration and look at this matter in a sensible way by transferring ALL OF THESE SITES TO RED.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: Colin McNab

Representor No: PRS01920

Representation ID: REP05685 Question Ref: H1

Re: LDF SITES IN MORLEY

The Green areas:-

Site 1282 - Laneside Farm (suggested capacity 542 houses).

Site 2125 - Manor House Farm (Pit Hill & Allotments)(suggested capacity 77 houses).

The Amber areas:-

Site 1220A - Land east of Churwell in field by the railway bridge (suggested capacity 281 houses).

Site 1099A – Land off Hepworth Avenue by M621 (suggested capacity 261 houses).

Site 1099B – Land off Hepworth Avenue by M621 (suggested capacity 80 houses).

Site 1996 – Snittles Farm, New Village Way (suggested capacity 7 houses).

I wish to object to the above plans for the following reasons:-

The above areas represent a green area that provides access to the Countryside in Urban Morley, Churwell New Village and Churwell.

Observation of bats, kingfisher, ducks and swifts. Much is made of supposed plentiful green sites but when we take away local green space, we can't get it back.

Proposed housing would require heavy vehicle traffic to gain access. Since New Village Way has a preponderance of town houses and flats, many cars are parked on both sides of the road, limiting access via this route. It is also relevant that children play on this and adjoining streets, making the addition of Heavy vehicle through traffic an increased hazard.

The overgrown fields which lead up to Pit Hill and the ground between the hill and the motorway have been grazed by tethered horses and ponies, since fixed by chain and tyres or stakes would indicate use by the travelling community.

The only other use for the land has been by local people walking dogs, sledging on the hill and children using the land for 'adventure'.

The areas house market has suffered greatly following the crash in the housing market in 2007. Persimmon sold property up to a value of 195000 and house prices have fallen to 151000 in the space of 6 years. Further house stock in this area would further devalue existing housing prices. It was stated by Persimmon when specifically asked if any further construction was envisaged, which would detract from the current views and house prices, that no further construction was likely due to the presence of the existing farm and poor drainage of the land below it.

Poor drainage and the presence of a storm culvert through Churwell New Village would raise concerns about the risk of flooding due to an increase of housing in that area.

No one wants to see further development in their own area, myself included. I am surprised by the imbalance of the planned housing development which appears to be focussed on the South side of Leeds. Why is Morley so heavily placed in the current plan. As I understand over the last two decades there has been a heavy burden placed on South Leeds with a minor role for North Leeds. This current plan further adds to that burden. It is very important that a Balance is seen to be shown in Housing Planning in all areas of Leeds.

I also note concern at the likely high speed train line that is to be routed to Leeds. As it will be from the South and West, Morley would again be faced with the greater disruption.

Sincerely trust you will give the above comments your consideration and look at this matter in a sensible way by transferring ALL OF THESE SITES TO RED.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: Colin McNab

Representor No: PRS01920

Representation ID: REP07525 Question Ref: General comment

Re: LDF SITES IN MORLEY

The Green areas:-

Site 1282 - Laneside Farm (suggested capacity 542 houses).

Site 2125 - Manor House Farm (Pit Hill & Allotments)(suggested capacity 77 houses).

The Amber areas:-

Site 1220A - Land east of Churwell in field by the railway bridge (suggested capacity 281 houses).

Site 1099A - Land off Hepworth Avenue by M621 (suggested capacity 261 houses).

Site 1099B - Land off Hepworth Avenue by M621 (suggested capacity 80 houses).

Site 1996 - Snittles Farm, New Village Way (suggested capacity 7 houses).

I wish to object to the above plans for the following reasons:-

The above areas represent a green area that provides access to the Countryside in Urban Morley, Churwell New Village and Churwell.

Observation of bats, kingfisher, ducks and swifts. Much is made of supposed plentiful green sites but when we take away local green space, we can't get it back.

Proposed housing would require heavy vehicle traffic to gain access. Since New Village Way has a preponderance of town houses and flats, many cars are parked on both sides of the road, limiting access via this route. It is also relevant that children play on this and adjoining streets, making the addition of Heavy vehicle through traffic an increased hazard.

The overgrown fields which lead up to Pit Hill and the ground between the hill and the motorway have been grazed by tethered horses and ponies, since fixed by chain and tyres or stakes would indicate use by the travelling community.

The only other use for the land has been by local people walking dogs, sledging on the hill and children using the land for 'adventure'.

The areas house market has suffered greatly following the crash in the housing market in 2007. Persimmon sold property up to a value of 195000 and house prices have fallen to 151000 in the space of 6 years. Further house stock in this area would further devalue existing housing prices. It was stated by Persimmon when specifically asked if any further construction was envisaged, which would detract from the current views and house prices, that no further construction was likely due to the presence of the existing farm and poor drainage of the land below it.

Poor drainage and the presence of a storm culvert through Churwell New Village would raise concerns about the risk of flooding due to an increase of housing in that area.

No one wants to see further development in their own area, myself included. I am surprised by the imbalance of the planned housing development which appears to be focussed on the South side of Leeds. Why is Morley so heavily placed in the current plan. As I understand over the last two decades there has been a heavy burden placed on South Leeds with a minor role for North Leeds. This current plan further adds to that burden. It is very important that a Balance is seen to be shown in Housing Planning in all areas of Leeds.

I also note concern at the likely high speed train line that is to be routed to Leeds. As it will be from the South and West, Morley would again be faced with the greater disruption.

Name: J Cowie

Representor No: PRS02227

Representation ID: REP04768 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Susan Holt

Representor No: PRS02289

Representation ID: REP04772 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Dereck Holt

Representor No: PRS02311

Representation ID: REP04766 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: Deborah Robinson

Representor No: PRS02324

Representation ID: REP04574 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House Farm. Change from Green to Red. Change from Green to Red. Should use all available brownfield sites first across Leeds. Heavy traffic congestion, infrastructure cannot take more properties, e.g schools, doctors. Churwell will lose its village identity.

Name: Peter Robinson

Representor No: PRS02325

Representation ID: REP04575 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House Farm Change from Green to Red. Should use all available brownfield sites first across Leeds. Heavy traffic congestion. Infrastructure cannot take more properties. E.g schools, doctors. Churwell will lose its village identity.

Name: Jenni Davenport

Representor No: PRS02330

Representation ID: REP04770 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North
This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Frank Raven

Representor No: PRS02339

Representation ID: REP04771 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North
This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: E Naylor

Representor No: PRS02363

Representation ID: REP04780 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North
This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Kathleen Paver

Representor No: PRS02372

Representation ID: REP04774 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North
This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: C Guy

Representor No: PRS02377

Representation ID: REP04767 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North
This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: C Clegg

Representor No: PRS02406

Representation ID: REP04663 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Doreen Gill

Representor No: PRS02496

Representation ID: REP04755 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: D Naylor

Representor No: PRS02497

Representation ID: REP04773 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: A Paver

Representor No: PRS02498

Representation ID: REP04775 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: James Bowers

Representor No: PRS02500

Representation ID: REP04777 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Alan Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02501

Representation ID: REP04778 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Vivienne Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02502

Representation ID: REP04779 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: Vivian Oxtoby

Representor No: PRS02504

Representation ID: REP04783 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Beryl Hewitt

Representor No: PRS02506

Representation ID: REP04785 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: D A Clegg

Representor No: PRS02507

Representation ID: REP04788 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Pauline Wood

Representor No: PRS02508

Representation ID: REP04790 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Joyce Thompson

Representor No: PRS02510

Representation ID: REP04792 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Patricia Aston

Representor No: PRS02513

Representation ID: REP04796 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: L. G Wilson

Representor No: PRS02515

Representation ID: REP04799 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: S Laurence

Representor No: PRS02517

Representation ID: REP04801 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: C Graham

Representor No: PRS02518

Representation ID: REP04803 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: M Allsop

Representor No: PRS02520

Representation ID: REP04805 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: R Hartill

Representor No: PRS02521

Representation ID: REP04806 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Edith Holmes

Representor No: PRS02522

Representation ID: REP04808 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Harry Holmes

Representor No: PRS02524

Representation ID: REP04811 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Ann Morse

Representor No: PRS02526

Representation ID: REP04813 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: L.r Morse

Representor No: PRS02527

Representation ID: REP04816 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Michael Hartill

Representor No: PRS02556

Representation ID: REP04847 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Jim Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02561

Representation ID: REP04852 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Helen Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02562

Representation ID: REP04855 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Ronald Gill

Representor No: PRS02564

Representation ID: REP04858 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: A.w Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02565

Representation ID: REP04859 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: J Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02566

Representation ID: REP04860 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: Norman Dearden

Representor No: PRS02568

Representation ID: REP04857 Question Ref: H1

2125 Manor House farm, Churwell, Site Capacity 77, Ward Morley North

This is part of the last remaining green area in Churwell. It is much used as a recreational and educational area which would be adversely affected by development. The local infrastructure cannot cope with such an addition.

Name: Fiona Doherty

Representor No: PRS02786

Representation ID: REP05330 Question Ref: H1

As residents of Churwell, we are writing with regard to the proposed housing development sites within our local community.

We all share the boundary of one of the sites in question, Site 1220A 'Land East of Churwell', and are particularly concerned over any possible proposal to build in this location.

We understand this is currently classified as 'Amber: Sites which have potential but issues / not as favoured as green sites'.

As clearly some of the issues have already been identified, we would like to re-iterate and clarify some of the issues that are of greatest concern to us as residents immediately neighbouring this location.

Churwell Hill / Elland Road is the main road from Morley towards Leeds, and as such suffers from a very high volume of traffic, particularly at commuting hours, when the traffic is at standstill to and from the Ring Road. This road does not have the ability to cope with greater volumes of traffic passing through the area, without creating greater risks to safety (cyclists, pedestrians, drivers) and increased congestion. This has already been identified as an issue as there are a number of speed cameras within a short space along this road.

This particular site, lies next to a busy train line, again posing dangers to locals, as it is not unusual for us to see people walking next to or crossing over the train line. This risk would only increase with additional housing in the area. Additionally, we understand the site has been identified as a historical land-fill area, again highlighting unsuitability.

Regarding the 6 sites identified in Churwell overall, the general infrastructure within the village is not of a scale that could accommodate such volumes of new houses, schools, doctors, dentists, and services in general would not be able to take on a new influx of residents.

Based on these, and other points, we strongly support the re-classification of this area (Site 1220A), and the other proposed Churwell sites, to colour code 'Red: Sites not considered suitable for allocation of housing'. Instead, we would ask the Planning Department to look at the areas within Leeds City Council that already have planning permission, and also, to revitalise housing currently standing empty, rather than look to build on Greenfield areas.

Name: Lindsay Marshall

Representor No: PRS02789

Representation ID: REP05333 Question Ref: H1

As residents of Churwell, we are writing with regard to the proposed housing development sites within our local community.

We all share the boundary of one of the sites in question, Site 1220A 'Land East of Churwell', and are particularly concerned over any possible proposal to build in this location.

We understand this is currently classified as 'Amber: Sites which have potential but issues / not as favoured as green sites'.

As clearly some of the issues have already been identified, we would like to re-iterate and clarify some of the issues that are of greatest concern to us as residents immediately neighbouring this location.

Churwell Hill / Elland Road is the main road from Morley towards Leeds, and as such suffers from a very high volume of traffic, particularly at commuting hours, when the traffic is at standstill to and from the Ring Road. This road does not have the ability to cope with greater volumes of traffic passing through the area, without creating greater risks to safety (cyclists, pedestrians, drivers) and increased congestion. This has already been identified as an issue as there are a number of speed cameras within a short space along this road.

This particular site, lies next to a busy train line, again posing dangers to locals, as it is not unusual for us to see people walking next to or crossing over the train line. This risk would only increase with additional housing in the area. Additionally, we understand the site has been identified as a historical land-fill area, again highlighting unsuitability.

Regarding the 6 sites identified in Churwell overall, the general infrastructure within the village is not of a scale that could accommodate such volumes of new houses, schools, doctors, dentists, and services in general would not be able to take on a new influx of residents.

Based on these, and other points, we strongly support the re-classification of this area (Site 1220A), and the other proposed Churwell sites, to colour code 'Red: Sites not considered suitable for allocation of housing'. Instead, we would ask the Planning Department to look at the areas within Leeds City Council that already have planning permission, and also, to revitalise housing currently standing empty, rather than look to build on Greenfield areas.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: Sharon Stockdale

Representor No: PRS02791

Representation ID: REP05338 Question Ref: H1

As residents of Churwell, we are writing with regard to the proposed housing development sites within our local community.

We all share the boundary of one of the sites in question, Site 1220A 'Land East of Churwell', and are particularly concerned over any possible proposal to build in this location.

We understand this is currently classified as 'Amber: Sites which have potential but issues / not as favoured as green sites'.

As clearly some of the issues have already been identified, we would like to re-iterate and clarify some of the issues that are of greatest concern to us as residents immediately neighbouring this location.

Churwell Hill / Elland Road is the main road from Morley towards Leeds, and as such suffers from a very high volume of traffic, particularly at commuting hours, when the traffic is at standstill to and from the Ring Road. This road does not have the ability to cope with greater volumes of traffic passing through the area, without creating greater risks to safety (cyclists, pedestrians, drivers) and increased congestion. This has already been identified as an issue as there are a number of speed cameras within a short space along this road.

This particular site, lies next to a busy train line, again posing dangers to locals, as it is not unusual for us to see people walking next to or crossing over the train line. This risk would only increase with additional housing in the area. Additionally, we understand the site has been identified as a historical land-fill area, again highlighting unsuitability.

Regarding the 6 sites identified in Churwell overall, the general infrastructure within the village is not of a scale that could accommodate such volumes of new houses, schools, doctors, dentists, and services in general would not be able to take on a new influx of residents.

Based on these, and other points, we strongly support the re-classification of this area (Site 1220A), and the other proposed Churwell sites, to colour code 'Red: Sites not considered suitable for allocation of housing'. Instead, we would ask the Planning Department to look at the areas within Leeds City Council that already have planning permission, and also, to revitalise housing currently standing empty, rather than look to build on Greenfield areas.

Name: S G Rhode

Representor No: PRS02792

Representation ID: REP05339 Question Ref: H1

As residents of Churwell, we are writing with regard to the proposed housing development sites within our local community.

We all share the boundary of one of the sites in question, Site 1220A 'Land East of Churwell', and are particularly concerned over any possible proposal to build in this location.

We understand this is currently classified as 'Amber: Sites which have potential but issues / not as favoured as green sites'.

As clearly some of the issues have already been identified, we would like to re-iterate and clarify some of the issues that are of greatest concern to us as residents immediately neighbouring this location.

Churwell Hill / Elland Road is the main road from Morley towards Leeds, and as such suffers from a very high volume of traffic, particularly at commuting hours, when the traffic is at standstill to and from the Ring Road. This road does not have the ability to cope with greater volumes of traffic passing through the area, without creating greater risks to safety (cyclists, pedestrians, drivers) and increased congestion. This has already been identified as an issue as there are a number of speed cameras within a short space along this road.

This particular site, lies next to a busy train line, again posing dangers to locals, as it is not unusual for us to see people walking next to or crossing over the train line. This risk would only increase with additional housing in the area. Additionally, we understand the site has been identified as a historical land-fill area, again highlighting unsuitability.

Regarding the 6 sites identified in Churwell overall, the general infrastructure within the village is not of a scale that could accommodate such volumes of new houses, schools, doctors, dentists, and services in general would not be able to take on a new influx of residents.

Based on these, and other points, we strongly support the re-classification of this area (Site 1220A), and the other proposed Churwell sites, to colour code 'Red: Sites not considered suitable for allocation of housing'. Instead, we would ask the Planning Department to look at the areas within Leeds City Council that already have planning permission, and also, to revitalise housing currently standing empty, rather than look to build on Greenfield areas.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: J Wilde

Representor No: PRS02794

Representation ID: REP05341 Question Ref: H1

As residents of Churwell, we are writing with regard to the proposed housing development sites within our local community. We all share the boundary of one of the sites in question, Site 1220A 'Land East of Churwell', and are particularly concerned over any possible proposal to build in this location.

We understand this is currently classified as 'Amber: Sites which have potential but issues / not as favoured as green sites'.

As clearly some of the issues have already been identified, we would like to re-iterate and clarify some of the issues that are of greatest concern to us as residents immediately neighbouring this location.

Churwell Hill / Elland Road is the main road from Morley towards Leeds, and as such suffers from a very high volume of traffic, particularly at commuting hours, when the traffic is at standstill to and from the Ring Road. This road does not have the ability to cope with greater volumes of traffic passing through the area, without creating greater risks to safety (cyclists, pedestrians, drivers) and increased congestion. This has already been identified as an issue as there are a number of speed cameras within a short space along this road.

This particular site, lies next to a busy train line, again posing dangers to locals, as it is not unusual for us to see people walking next to or crossing over the train line. This risk would only increase with additional housing in the area. Additionally, we understand the site has been identified as a historical land-fill area, again highlighting unsuitability.

Regarding the 6 sites identified in Churwell overall, the general infrastructure within the village is not of a scale that could accommodate such volumes of new houses, schools, doctors, dentists, and services in general would not be able to take on a new influx of residents.

Based on these, and other points, we strongly support the re-classification of this area (Site 1220A), and the other proposed Churwell sites, to colour code 'Red: Sites not considered suitable for allocation of housing'. Instead, we would ask the Planning Department to look at the areas within Leeds City Council that already have planning permission, and also, to revitalise housing currently standing empty, rather than look to build on Greenfield areas.

Name: Z Earnshaw

Representor No: PRS02795

Representation ID: REP05342 Question Ref: H1

As residents of Churwell, we are writing with regard to the proposed housing development sites within our local community. We all share the boundary of one of the sites in question, Site 1220A 'Land East of Churwell', and are particularly concerned over any possible proposal to build in this location.

We understand this is currently classified as 'Amber: Sites which have potential but issues / not as favoured as green sites'.

As clearly some of the issues have already been identified, we would like to re-iterate and clarify some of the issues that are of greatest concern to us as residents immediately neighbouring this location.

Churwell Hill / Elland Road is the main road from Morley towards Leeds, and as such suffers from a very high volume of traffic, particularly at commuting hours, when the traffic is at standstill to and from the Ring Road. This road does not have the ability to cope with greater volumes of traffic passing through the area, without creating greater risks to safety (cyclists, pedestrians, drivers) and increased congestion. This has already been identified as an issue as there are a number of speed cameras within a short space along this road.

This particular site, lies next to a busy train line, again posing dangers to locals, as it is not unusual for us to see people walking next to or crossing over the train line. This risk would only increase with additional housing in the area. Additionally, we understand the site has been identified as a historical land-fill area, again highlighting unsuitability.

Regarding the 6 sites identified in Churwell overall, the general infrastructure within the village is not of a scale that could accommodate such volumes of new houses, schools, doctors, dentists, and services in general would not be able to take on a new influx of residents.

Based on these, and other points, we strongly support the re-classification of this area (Site 1220A), and the other proposed Churwell sites, to colour code 'Red: Sites not considered suitable for allocation of housing'. Instead, we would ask the Planning Department to look at the areas within Leeds City Council that already have planning permission, and also, to revitalise housing currently standing empty, rather than look to build on Greenfield areas.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: S Robinson

Representor No: PRS02826

Representation ID: REP05378 Question Ref: H1

As residents of Churwell, we are writing with regard to the proposed housing development sites within our local community.

We all share the boundary of one of the sites in question, Site 1220A 'Land East of Churwell', and are particularly concerned over any possible proposal to build in this location.

We understand this is currently classified as 'Amber: Sites which have potential but issues / not as favoured as green sites'.

As clearly some of the issues have already been identified, we would like to re-iterate and clarify some of the issues that are of greatest concern to us as residents immediately neighbouring this location.

Churwell Hill / Elland Road is the main road from Morley towards Leeds, and as such suffers from a very high volume of traffic, particularly at commuting hours, when the traffic is at standstill to and from the Ring Road. This road does not have the ability to cope with greater volumes of traffic passing through the area, without creating greater risks to safety (cyclists, pedestrians, drivers) and increased congestion. This has already been identified as an issue as there are a number of speed cameras within a short space along this road.

This particular site, lies next to a busy train line, again posing dangers to locals, as it is not unusual for us to see people walking next to or crossing over the train line. This risk would only increase with additional housing in the area. Additionally, we understand the site has been identified as a historical land-fill area, again highlighting unsuitability.

Regarding the 6 sites identified in Churwell overall, the general infrastructure within the village is not of a scale that could accommodate such volumes of new houses, schools, doctors, dentists, and services in general would not be able to take on a new influx of residents.

Based on these, and other points, we strongly support the re-classification of this area (Site 1220A), and the other proposed Churwell sites, to colour code 'Red: Sites not considered suitable for allocation of housing'. Instead, we would ask the Planning Department to look at the areas within Leeds City Council that already have planning permission, and also, to revitalise housing currently standing empty, rather than look to build on Greenfield areas.

Name: Susan Burnley

Representor No: PRS02827

Representation ID: REP05380 Question Ref: H1

As residents of Churwell, we are writing with regard to the proposed housing development sites within our local community.

We all share the boundary of one of the sites in question, Site 1220A 'Land East of Churwell', and are particularly concerned over any possible proposal to build in this location.

We understand this is currently classified as 'Amber: Sites which have potential but issues / not as favoured as green sites'.

As clearly some of the issues have already been identified, we would like to re-iterate and clarify some of the issues that are of greatest concern to us as residents immediately neighbouring this location.

Churwell Hill / Elland Road is the main road from Morley towards Leeds, and as such suffers from a very high volume of traffic, particularly at commuting hours, when the traffic is at standstill to and from the Ring Road. This road does not have the ability to cope with greater volumes of traffic passing through the area, without creating greater risks to safety (cyclists, pedestrians, drivers) and increased congestion. This has already been identified as an issue as there are a number of speed cameras within a short space along this road.

This particular site, lies next to a busy train line, again posing dangers to locals, as it is not unusual for us to see people walking next to or crossing over the train line. This risk would only increase with additional housing in the area. Additionally, we understand the site has been identified as a historical land-fill area, again highlighting unsuitability.

Regarding the 6 sites identified in Churwell overall, the general infrastructure within the village is not of a scale that could accommodate such volumes of new houses, schools, doctors, dentists, and services in general would not be able to take on a new influx of residents.

Based on these, and other points, we strongly support the re-classification of this area (Site 1220A), and the other proposed Churwell sites, to colour code 'Red: Sites not considered suitable for allocation of housing'. Instead, we would ask the Planning Department to look at the areas within Leeds City Council that already have planning permission, and also, to revitalise housing currently standing empty, rather than look to build on Greenfield areas.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: Ken M

Representor No: PRS02829

Representation ID: REP05382 Question Ref: H1

As residents of Churwell, we are writing with regard to the proposed housing development sites within our local community. We all share the boundary of one of the sites in question, Site 1220A 'Land East of Churwell', and are particularly concerned over any possible proposal to build in this location. We understand this is currently classified as 'Amber: Sites which have potential but issues / not as favoured as green sites'. As clearly some of the issues have already been identified, we would like to re-iterate and clarify some of the issues that are of greatest concern to us as residents immediately neighbouring this location. Churwell Hill / Elland Road is the main road from Morley towards Leeds, and as such suffers from a very high volume of traffic, particularly at commuting hours, when the traffic is at standstill to and from the Ring Road. This road does not have the ability to cope with greater volumes of traffic passing through the area, without creating greater risks to safety (cyclists, pedestrians, drivers) and increased congestion. This has already been identified as an issue as there are a number of speed cameras within a short space along this road. This particular site, lies next to a busy train line, again posing dangers to locals, as it is not unusual for us to see people walking next to or crossing over the train line. This risk would only increase with additional housing in the area. Additionally, we understand the site has been identified as a historical land-fill area, again highlighting unsuitability. Regarding the 6 sites identified in Churwell overall, the general infrastructure within the village is not of a scale that could accommodate such volumes of new houses, schools, doctors, dentists, and services in general would not be able to take on a new influx of residents. Based on these, and other points, we strongly support the re-classification of this area (Site 1220A), and the other proposed Churwell sites, to colour code 'Red: Sites not considered suitable for allocation of housing'. Instead, we would ask the Planning Department to look at the areas within Leeds City Council that already have planning permission, and also, to revitalise housing currently standing empty, rather than look to build on Greenfield areas.

Name: Steve Hunter

Representor No: PRS04887

Representation ID: REP00675 Question Ref: H1

Lack of infrastructure & access

Representation ID: REP00675 Question Ref: H4

1099A/ 1099B/2125-poor access & a popular recreational area(was applied for as a Village Green in 2012) with over 125 written statements from people who have used the site for recreational purposes for over 20 years-all the roads leading to the sites are through high density housing and narrow.

Representation ID: REP00675 Question Ref: H5

1099A/ 1099B/2125-poor access & a popular recreational area(was applied for as a Village Green in 2012) with over 125 written statements from people who have used the site for recreational purposes for over 20 years-all the roads leading to the sites are through high density housing and narrow.

Representation ID: REP00675 Question Ref: H9

1099A/ 1099B/2125-poor access & a popular recreational area(was applied for as a Village Green in 2012) with over 125 written statements from people who have used the site for recreational purposes for over 20 years-all the roads leading to the sites are through high density housing and narrow.and should be allocated Greenspace

Representation ID: REP00675 Question Ref: H2

1099A/ 1099B/2125-poor access & a popular recreational area(was applied for as a Village Green in 2012) with over 125 written statements from people who have used the site for recreational purposes for over 20 years-all the roads leading to the sites are through high density housing and narrow.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: D Hutchinson

Representor No: PRS05106

Representation ID: REP05686 Question Ref: H1

I would like to log my objection to the planned housing developments 1032 and 2125/2155. I live on New lane, not the one shown on the map as New lane right through from Bradford Road which is in fact a dirt road that was used for transporting coal from the old pit to the mill, but the one that is a dead end up to the fields concerned. We have had many developments in our area and this has caused many problems for the residents ie. schools are too small, it took me nearly five weeks to see my doctor which are stretched to their limit even though they, like the schools have expanded. As a village we had 2 butchers, 4 shops, newsagents, 2 chemists, dentist, doctors and 2 post offices. We now have 1 shop plus a Tesco at the petrol station, 1 post office, no chemist, no doctors, no dentist (unless you go private) and things surely cannot go on. There is no mention of any of these amenities being provided unless I have missed it, it's just houses, houses and more houses. After you approved the Appletree Court at the back of my house our garden flooded and still does in bad weather, also killing all my fruit trees as the soil was so wet. The New lane (that isn't) development suffers these problems even to the point of there being ducks swimming so not exactly good building land. Please give us a break and let the amenities we have the time to catch up or provide them.

Name: Keith & Margaret Barber

Representor No: PRS05245

Representation ID: REP05839 Question Ref: H1

We wish to object and protest in the strongest possible terms to the proposals for building 1248 houses in Churwell.

The site numbers are 1282, 2125, 122A, 1099A, 1099B, 1996. Any research into the Churwell area will indicate how impractical these proposals are.

There is only one road in & out of Churwell which is already heavily congested during normal time and becomes completely gridlocked in the a.m. & p.m. rush hours it is also a major health & safety hazard as any observations will indicate.

Access to these proposed sites would add significantly to the already existing problems. There is already a shortage of places at schools in the area, additional population would necessitate commuting for children making even more traffic problems.

We would request that you take serious consideration of the items highlighted in this letter and permit the existing population to enjoy their amenity in safety and comfort.

Name: Sylvia Elsby

Representor No: PRS05430

Representation ID: REP06037 Question Ref: H1

2125 – Suggested change – GREEN to RED

Reason for change – In Greenbelt, few green areas left in Churwell.

Other remarks – Concerns about access through already densely built up area, Manor Farm Estate onto congested Elland Road. Concerns about impact on already over-loaded infrastructure.

Name: Jacqueline Daniel

Representor No: PRS05449

Representation ID: REP06061 Question Ref: H1

2125 – Suggested change GREEN to RED

Reasons for change - Insufficient infrastructure (schools, dentist, doctors) to cope with additional population.

Other remarks – Building on allotments takes away facilities from the existing population of Churwell, removing the little public space available.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: Persimmon Homes

Representor No: PRS05691

Representation ID: REP06653 Question Ref: H1

Site 2125 – Manor House Farm, Churwell – Support in principle

We support the principle of identifying this site as green.

However the assessment does show the presence of Listed Buildings but this is not the case.

Persimmon homes has the following comments which should be taken into account in the site assessment, namely:

- Site Details
- Distances - The Council should make clear at what point / route it has used in identifying the distance to a rail station and bus stop.
- Our assessment shows that the site is well related to Cottingley rail station and is within a reasonable walking distance of frequent bus services on Elland Road.
- In particular, at the closest point of the whole site the nearest bus stop is within 400 metres of the site.
- At the closest point of the whole site that is under the control of Persimmon, Cottingley Rail Station is located less than 250 metres away. The site is therefore highly accessible and this should be reflected in the assessment.
- SHLAA – Persimmon Homes has an interest in this site and is committed to bringing forward this site for development. Therefore the site is available, suitable and achievable.
- Conformity with Core Strategy – The site is well related to a major settlement and would be a major settlement greenfield extension.

The Council has scored this site 11 out of 15. However it is unclear at this stage what methodology the council has used in reaching this conclusion and we therefore reserve the right to comment in more detail once this information has been made available.

We would recommend that the Council:

- Clarifies how it has assessed the distance to the rail station and bus stop. Nevertheless from the assessment outlined above it is clear that the site is extremely well related to Cottingley rail station (just 250m) and is within a reasonable walking distance of frequent bus services on Elland Road (within 400m).
- Correct the references to Listed buildings accordingly.
- States that the site is available, suitable and achievable.
- States that the development of this site conforms to the Core Strategy and is a greenfield extension.
- Provides further information on what information it has used to rank the site.

We have reviewed both the consultation documentation and compared this to technical work undertaken and our own assessment. We have found that:

- The site assessment work undertaken by the Council is inaccurate and not a robust basis upon which to make an adequate assessment.
- Our assessment work shows that the site has no constraints that could prevent development from coming forward on it in the near future.

The site is available it is suitable for development and is therefore deliverable. There is no known planning policy or technical constraints that could prevent development from coming forward on the site at the earliest opportunity. The site is wholly appropriate for development and should be allocated for housing in the Site Allocations Preferred Options Document.

Representation ID: REP06653 Question Ref: H11

We consider that sites 1099A, 1099B and 2125 are available immediately for development. Therefore we consider development can be achieved on the sites in the short term i.e. within 5 years and leading into the medium to longer term.

Name: Michael Harrison

Representor No: PRS06042

Representation ID: REP06880 Question Ref: H4

Firstly I find it amazing our council can ever consider building more houses in Churwell when the facilities such as schools, doctors, are already over full capacity.

The traffic in Churwell is already at dangerous levels. The roads in and around Churwell are already over the capacity they can cope with. Churwell is a village, let us keep it that way otherwise it will just become an extension of Leeds city centre.

I also feel there is no demand for more houses in Churwell. The fact LCC is even considering these sites tells me LCC is not considering the feelings of its residents and its repairs to roads, etc is already a great let down. Totally I am in disagreement with any of these sites for the above reasons.

Name: Anthony Holmes

Representor No: PRS06179

Representation ID: REP07067 Question Ref: H1

2125 – Change suggested GREEN to RED

Reason – Greenfield Site

Other remarks – High volumes of traffic, Churwell Hill will lose its village status.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: C Hutchinson

Representor No: PRS06307

Representation ID: REP07234 Question Ref: H1

I would like to log my objection to the planned housing developments 1032 and 2125/2155. I live on New lane, not the one shown on the map as New lane right through from Bradford Road which is in fact a dirt road that was used for transporting coal from the old pit to the mill, but the one that is a dead end up to the fields concerned. We have had many developments in our area and this has caused many problems for the residents ie. schools are too small, it took me nearly five weeks to see my doctor which are stretched to their limit even though they like the schools have expanded. As a village we had 2 butchers, 4 shops, newsagents, 2 chemists, dentist, doctors and 2 post offices. We now have 1 shop plus a Tesco at the petrol station, 1 post office, no chemist, no doctors, no dentist (unless you go private) and things surely cannot go on. There is no mention of any of these amenities being provided unless I have missed it, it's just houses, houses and more houses. After you approved the Appletree Court at the back of my house our garden flooded and still does in bad weather, also killing all my fruit trees as the soil was so wet. The New lane (that isn't) development suffers these problems even to the point of there being ducks swimming so not exactly good building land. Please give us a break and let the amenities we have the time to catch up or provide them.

Name: Lew Beever

Representor No: PRS06545

Representation ID: REP02127 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Change from Green to Red. Recreational area, brown spare, lack of access. This site was set aside for village green status but failed on a technicality.

Name: H Pearson

Representor No: PRS06546

Representation ID: REP02130 Question Ref: H1

2125 - Change from Green to Red. Lots of people go dog walking, no spaces at Churwell primary school. People will leave the area as it will become too congested.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 4 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' and 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network.

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network)

From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service frequency levels.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites - green sites are linked to this comment]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2125

Housing

Manor House Farm, Churwell

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H1

Disagree with Council's green assessment, think the site should be amber

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H1

Disagree with Council's green assessment, think the site should be amber

Name: Alan Bellwood

Representor No: PRS07148

Representation ID: REP08304 Question Ref: H1

1282 / 2125 -

I wish to object to the above plans for the following reasons:-

Some of the sites are on green belt land such as 1282— Laneside Farm. I think it is important to preserve some green spaces locally as once they are built on, they will be lost forever!

The 1282 Laneside Farm and 2125 Manor House Farm sites in particular separate Churwell from Morley which helps Churwell retain its village character. The same can be said for all sites as they are all bordering Churwell.

Local Schools cannot cope with the number of children currently enrolling into them. My son started Churwell School in 2012 at which there were 85 applicants for only 60 places in the reception year. Some Churwell children were allocated places outside the area in Beeston, etc. Other Schools in Morley similarly had greater numbers of applications than places resulting in an extra class having to be run in Asquith School, Morley. The numbers of houses proposed for the area will obviously mean that there would be a huge increase in children in the area which will affect both primary and high schools. Local councillors/MPs are campaigning for Churwell children to be offered places at Churwell Schools and also Morley children to be offered a place at a Morley school where it has been requested.

Doctors and dentists are at capacity currently.

Such a massive development will have an impact on the roads. It is now 'the norm' for traffic to queue out of Churwell towards the ring road on a morning and for a slow crawl of traffic back up through Churwell in the evening rush hour. Not only would extra traffic inconvenience road users further, but I think pollution increases should be looked into too.

Finally, I am aware that these developments have been publicised and that there is a lot of local opposition to them. Please remember that the council is run to represent the community and allowing unsustainable levels of house building such as these is against the vast majority of the public's wishes. I would suggest visiting Churwell to conduct a survey to assess opinion of the public. Please side with the Leeds communities rather than the national house builders.

I sincerely trust you will give the above comments your consideration and look at this matter in a sensible way by transferring ALL OF THESE SITES TO RED.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2127

Housing

Tingley Station

Name: Brian Guy

Representor No: PRS00142

Representation ID: REP04659 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: Wenda P Whitehead

Representor No: PRS00312

Representation ID: REP04786 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: Janice Beever

Representor No: PRS00441

Representation ID: REP04791 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: P S Barrie

Representor No: PRS00915

Representation ID: REP04769 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Representation ID: REP04810 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Representation ID: REP04781 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: Lynne Paul

Representor No: PRS01169

Representation ID: REP04800 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2127

Housing

Tingley Station

Name: D Paul

Representor No: PRS01183

Representation ID: REP04793 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: B Stringer

Representor No: PRS01606

Representation ID: REP04797 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: L.e Beever

Representor No: PRS01607

Representation ID: REP04804 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: Jack Dunn

Representor No: PRS02207

Representation ID: REP04441 Question Ref: H5

2127 –

Now amber. Whilst part of the site was released for development in 2006 after no longer required for a park and ride facility for super tram. Half of the site is leased to the local equestrian centre and is used for grazing. If this facility is taken away the owners of the centre will lose their living. As Ward Councillor I am anxious that if the centre goes the opportunity for our young people to ride horses will be lost. The owners have worked hard to retain the centre and should be supported.

Name: J Cowie

Representor No: PRS02227

Representation ID: REP04768 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: Susan Holt

Representor No: PRS02289

Representation ID: REP04772 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2127

Housing

Tingley Station

Name: Dereck Holt

Representor No: PRS02311

Representation ID: REP04766 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: Jenni Davenport

Representor No: PRS02330

Representation ID: REP04770 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: Frank Raven

Representor No: PRS02339

Representation ID: REP04771 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: E Naylor

Representor No: PRS02363

Representation ID: REP04780 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: Kathleen Paver

Representor No: PRS02372

Representation ID: REP04774 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: C Guy

Representor No: PRS02377

Representation ID: REP04767 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2127

Housing

Tingley Station

Name: C Clegg

Representor No: PRS02406

Representation ID: REP04663 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: Doreen Gill

Representor No: PRS02496

Representation ID: REP04755 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: D Naylor

Representor No: PRS02497

Representation ID: REP04773 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: A Paver

Representor No: PRS02498

Representation ID: REP04775 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: James Bowers

Representor No: PRS02500

Representation ID: REP04777 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: Alan Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02501

Representation ID: REP04778 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2127

Housing

Tingley Station

Name: Vivienne Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02502

Representation ID: REP04779 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: Vivian Oxtoby

Representor No: PRS02504

Representation ID: REP04783 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: Beryl Hewitt

Representor No: PRS02506

Representation ID: REP04785 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: D A Clegg

Representor No: PRS02507

Representation ID: REP04788 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: Pauline Wood

Representor No: PRS02508

Representation ID: REP04790 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: Joyce Thompson

Representor No: PRS02510

Representation ID: REP04792 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2127

Housing

Tingley Station

Name: Patricia Aston

Representor No: PRS02513

Representation ID: REP04796 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: L. G Wilson

Representor No: PRS02515

Representation ID: REP04799 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: S Laurence

Representor No: PRS02517

Representation ID: REP04801 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: C Graham

Representor No: PRS02518

Representation ID: REP04803 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: M Allsop

Representor No: PRS02520

Representation ID: REP04805 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: R Hartill

Representor No: PRS02521

Representation ID: REP04806 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2127

Housing

Tingley Station

Name: Edith Holmes

Representor No: PRS02522

Representation ID: REP04808 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: Harry Holmes

Representor No: PRS02524

Representation ID: REP04811 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: Ann Morse

Representor No: PRS02526

Representation ID: REP04813 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: L.r Morse

Representor No: PRS02527

Representation ID: REP04816 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: Michael Hartill

Representor No: PRS02556

Representation ID: REP04847 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: Jim Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02561

Representation ID: REP04852 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2127

Housing

Tingley Station

Name: Helen Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02562

Representation ID: REP04855 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: Ronald Gill

Representor No: PRS02564

Representation ID: REP04858 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: A.w Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02565

Representation ID: REP04859 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: J Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02566

Representation ID: REP04860 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: Norman Dearden

Representor No: PRS02568

Representation ID: REP04857 Question Ref: H4

H3 - 2127 Tingley Station, Capacity 1133, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A development of this size is a community in itself. It does not impinge on the settlements in the Morley area and is bounded in the south by the M62 motorway. Many of the infrastructure objections made regarding green coded sites in the answer above apply also to this site. Perhaps the site boundary could be extended towards Middleton so that a school can be provided? This site could provide 20% of Outer South West's currently proposed target without materially affecting existing communities with notable exception of transport problems.

Name: Mark Brennan

Representor No: PRS03782

Representation ID: REP01655 Question Ref: H1

With numerous disused brownfield sites within the "outer south west" area it seems unbelievable that consideration is being given to the development of greenfield sites. The reason given by Leeds City Council that the brownfield sites are not to be developed is that remedial works would be too expensive. Should this be the case, it would suggest that these sites are heavily contaminated and pose a potential risk to human health and controlled waters. On this basis I would enquire why these sites are not being investigated as potential "Part 2A" sites. I feel it would make more sense developing the brownfield sites prior to targetting greenfield sites, as the risk and treatment of ground contamination is simply being ignored and delayed. Brownfield sites identified include but not limited to 2117, 2096, 2096A, 2096B, 2096C, 3075

Representation ID: REP01655 Question Ref: H3

Several brownfield sites as detailed earlier (namely 2096, 2096A - C, 3075' 3120, 1018A & B, 2127)

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2127

Housing

Tingley Station

Name: J & J Prescott

Representor No: PRS04996

Representation ID: REP02008 Question Ref: H4

2127 & 1143F Over reliance on the M62 corridor with issues of poor amenity noise etc.

Name: Hoare

Representor No: PRS05410

Representation ID: REP06016 Question Ref: H4

2127 – Tingley Station

4.24 This is large site currently identified in the UDP as land designated as PAS. The council have recently released selected PAS sites across the district on a phased basis.

4.25 The site is bound to the north by Green Belt, to the east by Thorpe Lane, to the south by the M62 motorway and to the west by Dewsbury Road. While the site is located to the east of Morley and to the north of West Ardsley, it is isolated and any future proposals would depend upon heavy infrastructure.

Recommendation – reclassify this site as 'red' due to the identified physical constraints

Name: Lisa Mulherin

Representor No: PRS05734

Representation ID: REP07126 Question Ref: H4

2127 Tingley Station – This would lead to the development of a whole new village unconnected to the existing settlements. Existing schools, GPs surgeries in the area could not sustain this level of development. Considerable transport improvements would be required. It ought to be Red as with neighbouring site 2099.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2127

Housing

Tingley Station

Name: Sterling Capitol

Representor No: PRS05764

Representation ID: REP06434 Question Ref: H4

Site Ref: 2127 - Tingley Station

We have concerns regarding the robustness of the assessment carried out in respect of other sites, in particular that prepared for Tingley Station (Site 2127). We note that the emerging Leeds Core Strategy Publication Version 2012 includes reference to 'Protected Areas of Search Land'. Paragraph 4.8.6 confirms that the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (UDP) designated land outside of the Green Belt for unidentified needs in the future (i.e. known as Protected Areas of Search (PAS)) and that this land will provide one of the prime sources for housing allocations in the LDF.

Whilst it is accepted that PAS sites will be one of the sources for housing allocations the emerging Core Strategy confirms that the allocation of sites will depend on how well it meets the strategy for housing distribution, embodied by the criteria in Spatial Policy 6. It also states that land not appropriate for housing might be needed for employment allocations or retained as future PAS in the LDF.

It is noted that Tingley Station (Site 2127) is a defined PAS site within the UDP, although we note that Leeds City Council (LCC) sought to remove this designation as part of the UDP Review in 2006 and return the site to Green Belt. The Tingley Station site lies on the Supertram's originally planned route and this locational advantage played a significant part in its original designation as a PAS site in 2000. The adopted UDP advised that the "The site will only be considered in future at a review of the Plan and in the event that the Supertram link to Tingley is implemented or firmly committed." The Council considered, at the time of the UDP Review, that the construction of the Tingley section of the Supertram was most unlikely and that the reason for taking the land out of the Green Belt and designating it as a PAS site had effectively gone. At the time of the UDP Inquiry, the Inspector considered that it would be premature to conclude that the Tingley section of the Supertram route would never be built and that this aspect of the circumstances which led to the PAS designation had been clearly and permanently falsified justifying the sites return to Green Belt.

However, it is noted that the suitability of the Tingley Station site for housing was considered at the Leeds UDP Review Inquiry and the Inspector commented on this issue in deciding whether the site should be allocated for housing. The Inspector advised that:

"In my view the site would not be a suitable one for residential development; it is greenfield land which is not well integrated with existing communities or particularly close to local services and facilities."

The Inspector also considered whether the site should be allocated for employment uses, as part of the UDP Review. The Inspector advised that whilst PAS sites may be considered for any use if required in the long term, based on the history, character and location of Tingley Station, this indicates its suitability for employment purposes rather than for housing. The Inspector considered at the time of the UDP Review Inquiry that there was not a pressing need to allocate this site for employment use (based on the then existing supply of employment land) and that such an allocation may divert attention and investment away from the regeneration efforts at being pursued at Aire Valley Leeds.

As outlined above, draft Core Strategy Spatial Policy 1 'Location of Development' criteria (ii) confirms that settlements within the hierarchy will guide the identification of land for development including:

- a. Previously developed land and buildings within the settlement,
- b. Other suitable infill sites within the relevant settlement,
- c. Key locations identified as sustainable extensions to the relevant settlement.

We note that Tingley Station (Site 2127) is identified as a site which 'has potential to be allocated for housing', however it acknowledges that it has issues or not as favoured as green sites (i.e. sites which have greatest potential for allocation). In light of the above commentary in respect of the 2006 UDP Review and the clear policy direction under draft Spatial Policy 1, we are surprised that this site has been identified as having any potential for housing allocation. The site is clearly isolated from any of the identified urban area and given the clear lack of connections to any of existing settlements (i.e. Morley, Tingley and Middleton) it cannot be concluded that the site will form a 'sustainable extension' as required by Draft Core Strategy Spatial Policy 1.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2127

Housing

Tingley Station

Name: The Sir Robert Ogden Partnership Ltd

Representor No: PRS05834

Representation ID: REP06542 Question Ref: H1

Site 2127

The Tingley Station site (Site Ref: 2127) has been colour coded amber, but it is maintained this site should be colour coded green.

Sites identified as amber are deemed to either have issues which need to be resolved or where they are not considered to be in such a favoured location as those highlighted in green.

A review of the more detailed individual site assessment identifies the site scores well in relation to the majority of factors considered. Highways conclude that they support the allocation of this site for housing development with mitigation to improve linkages to adjacent settlements.

West Yorkshire Ecology and the Council's Ecology officer also support the allocation of the site with mitigation to ensure the disused railway that runs through the site is retained and enhanced for its grassland and scrub habitats. The masterplan for the site shows this route is to be retained as a footpath through the site.

The detailed site assessment identifies the site is supported for allocation and issues identified can be mitigated. In this regard it is considered the site is one which has the greatest potential to be allocated for housing as the Council's conclusion that there is a lack of connection to the urban area can be addressed and as such is not an issue which needs to be resolved.

In relation to the site's connectivity, the masterplan and associated design submission document (dated February 2013) identifies the existing footpaths, bridleways, restricted byways and byways which cross through the site. The masterplan proposal seeks to include, improve and extend these existing routes.

The primary point of access to the site will be via a new roundabout on Thorpe Lane. A secondary access will be taken from the west of the site onto the A653 Dewsbury Road (North) to form a priority junction. This secondary access will be limited to pedestrians, cyclists and emergency vehicles only.

There are a number of local services and facilities within the vicinity of the site. Capitol Business Park, the White Rose Shopping Centre and Office Park, as well as primary and secondary schools are within easy walking and cycling distance of the site. Pedestrian and cycle access will be available from the A652 Dewsbury Road and the A654 Thorpe Lane, thereby maximising connectivity with the nearby retail and employment opportunities.

The site benefits from existing bus routes operating along the A653 Dewsbury Road and the A654 Thorpe Lane with frequent services to Leeds, Wakefield, Bradford, Dewsbury and the White Rose Shopping Centre. The bus stops located on the A653 Dewsbury Road are within the recommended 400 metre desirable walking distance.

The masterplan for the site has specifically sought to improve the connectivity of this site with the surrounding area. As previously stated, the site benefits from existing footpaths, bridleways and byways, which will be improved and extended. The route of the former railway line will be used to create a 'greenway' for pedestrians and cyclists, linking into the existing network and creating a walkable neighbourhood.

To the east an existing railway viaduct provides the potential to link a pedestrian and cycling route to footpaths 214 and 255 to Middleton. Both Dunningley Lane and the course of Denshaw Beck are site features that can be enhanced to promote north-south connectivity that would extend beyond the site to the north.

To the west, existing definitive footpaths leading to Morley can be linked at the Capitol Park road junction and further to the south along Dewsbury Road by the provision of a new pedestrian crossing to connect footpath 70 and footpaths 68 and 69.

To the south, access to Tingley is gained via Thorpe lane. The site access will be taken from Thorpe Lane and will therefore provide a direct route to the south of the motorway for cars, pedestrians and cyclists.

It is therefore evident from the development of a masterplan for the site and the associated design document, which draws on the conclusions of the technical supporting reports that have been prepared, the site's current lack of connectivity can be wholly addressed with routes throughout the site providing access to Morley, Capitol Park, the White Rose Shopping Centre, Middleton and Tingley.

It is therefore evident the Council has identified the site to be 'amber' as the site is deemed to be suitable for residential development but it was considered the site's lack of connectivity was an 'issue to be resolved'. The masterplan for the site ensures the site's connectivity with the surrounding residential areas, shopping and employment opportunities. The masterplan for the site and associated design document clearly identifies the site's permeability can be improved with strong connections with the surrounding residential areas and associated local services. On this basis, there are no issues to resolve and the site is one which has the greatest potential to be allocated for housing and as such should be identified as a green site.

On the basis of the evidence set out, it is maintained the site is in a wholly suitable location for development and there are no connectivity issues to resolve, the masterplan for the site demonstrates that links can be achieved to the north, east, south and west of the site. In this regard, there are no issues to resolve with the site and it is not in a less favourable location. The site should therefore be colour coded green.

See also representation submitted for full details

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2127

Housing

Tingley Station

Name: The Sir Robert Ogden Partnership Ltd

Representor No: PRS05834

Representation ID: REP07664 Question Ref: H4

2127 - Disagree should be green - see submitted rep for full details

The Tingley Station site has been demonstrated to be suitable, available, achievable and developable for residential development and as such, the allocation of this site for housing should be supported.

7.2 The Sir Robert Ogden Partnership Ltd welcomes the site being identified as a site that is suitable for housing development. However, it is maintained and supported by evidence that the site should be colour coded green rather than amber.

7.3 The Council's assessment concludes the site is suitable for allocation with appropriate mitigation, in particular the Council considered the site lacks connectivity with the surrounding settlements of Morley, Tingley and Middlethorpe. A masterplan for the site has been prepared which demonstrates that access routes can be delivered to ensure the site is well connected to these settlements.

7.4 In this regard there are no issues to resolve and as such the site should be colour coded green as it is a site which has the greatest potential to be allocated and can deliver dwellings in the short term to assist the Council in achieving a five year housing land supply, as required by the NPPF.

Representation ID: REP06542 Question Ref: H4

Site 2127

Some of the sites that have been identified as 'amber' represent sites with potential for future housing development but are sites with issues which the Council does not have sufficient information to determine whether they can be resolved.

However, there are amber sites where an issue has been identified but there is a known solution, such as in the case of Tingley Station (ref: 2127). The Council suggest there are issues to resolve in relation to the site's connectivity, but the masterplan and associated technical reports provided as part of these representations provide the Council with sufficient evidence that this issue can be addressed. On this basis, it is considered that sites should not be identified as amber solely because the Council has identified potential development constraints, due consideration should be given the ease of mitigating or resolving the issue identified.

Representation ID: REP06542 Question Ref: H4

Site 2127

The Tingley Station site has been identified as an amber site when it would be more appropriate for the site to be coded as a green, given the site has the greatest potential for allocation.

As previously stated, whilst the Council consider the site's existing lack of connection is a constraint, the masterplan for the site which has been prepared based on the findings of detailed technical supporting reports provides clear evidence the development of the site can be achieved and routes provided to link the site with the residential areas and shopping and employment opportunities to the north, east, south and west of the site. This 'issue' has therefore been addressed and as such there is no 'issue' to resolve.

The Council suggest that 4,154 dwellings can be delivered from sites they have classified as being 'green'. Based on the Council's calculation, sites to deliver 5,499 units will be required, although our evidence suggests this figure should be higher. Even on the Council's evidence, the capacity from green sites is only 4,154 dwellings and therefore 1,345 dwellings will need to be delivered from 'amber' sites in any event. However, it is maintained there is detailed evidence the Tingley Station site does not have any potential issues to resolve and therefore this site will increase the number of 'green' sites in the Outer South West area and contribute towards meeting the housing requirement in this area.

Representation ID: REP06542 Question Ref: H11

Site 2127

The Tingley Station (ref: 2127) should be developed in the short term. This site is deliverable in the short term as it is available now, it offers a suitable location for development now and is achievable, as there is a realistic prospect that housing can be delivered within five years.

See also representation submitted for full details

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2127

Housing

Tingley Station

Name: Neil Dawson

Representor No: PRS05884

Representation ID: REP06563 Question Ref: General comment

Potential Education and School sites

The increased level of housing demand will put pressure on schools to accommodate more pupils and therefore there should be some consideration of potential sites for new or extensions to existing schools to ensure there is sufficient capacity for the increased number of children expected to attend schools.

Some initial suggestions are as follows;

Sites 1064A, 3467. These sites are in the Morley urban area with suggested employment use but these may be suitable sites for a new primary school particularly if other housing developments proceed in the Bruntcliffe area.

The PAS site, 2127, at Tingley Station is a large development which along with other developments on nearby on Thorpe Lane is of such a size that it should potentially include a primary school site within or nearby.

At the existing Bruntcliffe School there is some potential to expand at the rear of the current site to either expand the existing school or provide primary provision.

Site 1166 which is adjacent to the existing school at Asquith could be utilized for expansion of the school.

Name: Karen Renshaw

Representor No: PRS06048

Representation ID: REP06876 Question Ref: H4

2127 – Tingley Station, This land is unsuitable and is required to enhance the green corridor which has funding for the development of the local environment, involving young people and local schools. Again, transport, Dr's ,safety, schools, along with the general infrastructure would have to be looked at in depth before any decisions could be made. Area within this village is required for its character and historical elements. Many of the reasons for opposing all these sites identified are based on the lack of infrastructure, schools & education, transport, safety , health & well-being, Gp's surgeries, poor links with public transport, noise, pollution and busy highways created by the increased volume of traffic. Please take all these serious matters into account and I would appreciate a briefing before any further decisions are made.

Name: Liongate Developments Limited

Representor No: PRS06410

Representation ID: REP07389 Question Ref: H4

Site 2127 — Tingley Station [to red]

This is large site currently identified in the UDP as land designated as PAS. The council have recently released selected PAS sites across the district on a phased basis. The site is bound to the north by Green Belt, to the east by Thorpe Lane, to the south by the M62 motorway and to the west by Dewsbury Road. While the site is located to the east of Morley and to the north of West Ardsley, it is isolated and any future proposals would depend upon heavy infrastructure.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2127

Housing

Tingley Station

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H4

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Amber Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H4

Site 2127 - An unfortunate UDP PAS allocation which, if it were possible, ought to be returned to Green Belt. Amber to red.

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H4

We don't believe that the large, isolated site at Tingley Station, LDF site 2127, would be suitable for housing; it was meant to accommodate large-scale employment uses which might have appeared if a supertram route had passed on its way to a terminus nearby at Blackgates on the A650. Perhaps it shouldn't have been removed from Green Belt in the UDP; it should now be marked red against housing purposes; it might have a different LDF colour coding for another use, or might remain PAS.

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H4

Disagree with Council's amber assessment, think the site should be red

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H4

Site 2127 - An unfortunate UDP PAS allocation which, if it were possible, ought to be returned to Green Belt. Amber to red.

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H4

We don't believe that the large, isolated site at Tingley Station, LDF site 2127, would be suitable for housing; it was meant to accommodate large-scale employment uses which might have appeared if a supertram route had passed on its way to a terminus nearby at Blackgates on the A650. Perhaps it shouldn't have been removed from Green Belt in the UDP; it should now be marked red against housing purposes; it might have a different LDF colour coding for another use, or might remain PAS.

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H4

Disagree with Council's amber assessment, think the site should be red

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2128

Housing

New Lane, East Ardsley

Name: Rita Platt

Representor No: PRS00127

Representation ID: REP00534 Question Ref: H1

2128 - We live so near to this proposed development, and our doctor's and schools are already bursting at the seams. There are too many new housing estates already covering our village and green fields.

Name: Elaine Houghton

Representor No: PRS00158

Representation ID: REP01828 Question Ref: H1

2128 - Green to red. Additional housing would overload existing infrastructure. Proposed new development has not been co-ordinated with neighbouring local authorities.

Name: Melissa Houghton

Representor No: PRS00161

Representation ID: REP01829 Question Ref: H1

2128 - Green to red. Additional housing would overload existing infrastructure. Proposed new development has not been co-ordinated with neighbouring planning authorities.

Name: Christopher Houghton

Representor No: PRS00167

Representation ID: REP01831 Question Ref: H1

2128 - Green to red. Additional housing would overload existing infrastructure. Drainage is already poor . Proposed new development has not been co-ordinated with neighbouring local authorities.

Name: Alan Johnson

Representor No: PRS00168

Representation ID: REP01840 Question Ref: H1

2128 - Green to red. Additional housing would overload existing infrastructure. Proposed new development has not been co-ordinated with neighbouring local authorities.

Name: A Hoggins

Representor No: PRS00169

Representation ID: REP02096 Question Ref: H1

2128 - Green to red. Additional housing would overload existing infrastructure. Proposed new development has not been co-ordinated with neighbouring local authorities.

Name: Audrey Jones

Representor No: PRS00561

Representation ID: REP02513 Question Ref: H1

2128 - Green belt land
No places in schools.
No places in doctors.
Traffic build up.

Name: Reg Glover

Representor No: PRS00778

Representation ID: REP02789 Question Ref: H1

2128 - Green to red. Additional housing would overload existing infrastructure. Proposed new development has not been co-ordinated with neighbouring planning authorities.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2128

Housing

New Lane, East Ardsley

Name: Peter Buckley

Representor No: PRS00792

Representation ID: REP02804 Question Ref: H1

2128 -

The A650 at Tingley and East Ardsley has already seen a huge increase in traffic due to large scale housing expansion and so adding more will only increase the areas problems.

A large housing development on this site, which if linked with site number 1032 would make a very large site with direct access to the A650, will only:-

i) Increase the number of vehicles on an already busy road which has many pinch points through the village caused by double sided parking which at times leads to queuing and traffic gridlock. To add to this mix traffic often is seen waiting on the road to enter the Esso/Tesco site, as predicted when opposing the planning application for the development. Accidents along this stretch are just waiting to happen and do not forget that this is a relief road for the M1 at times. The alternative road access for this site is Moor Knowl Lane which is too narrow to take further development.

ii) The primary schools are already full and proposed extensions will only address the needs of the existing population so further housing will only make a bad situation worse.

iii) Appointments at the Leigh View Medical Practice usually necessitate a 3 week wait and increasing the number of houses in the area will only make this time longer or plain impossible.

THIS SITE SHOULD NOT BE DEVELOPED AS IT WILL ADD TO THE AREAS PROBLEMS.
IT IS A SHORT TERM STATISTICAL SOLUTION WITHOUT ANY THOUGHT FOR THE LIVES OF CURRENT RESIDENTS.

Name: Denise Buckley

Representor No: PRS00795

Representation ID: REP02807 Question Ref: H1

562 / 1032 / 2128-

My main concern is the impact on the A650. You can extend the school (already underway), the doctor's surgery (3 weeks waiting time for an appointment currently) but the road cannot be improved.

Continued additions of traffic lights just lead to further congestion. Consider all the developments proposed through Morley, Tingley and into East Ardsley totalling more than 1500 homes. The road is already heavily congested not only at peak times but most of the day. Parking on both sides of the road from Woodhouse Lane to the traffic lights near Tesco is already leading to major traffic build ups. Side roads are becoming dangerous with overspill parking and sometimes customers for Room 97, the hairdressers, park on the pelican zig zag lines. The lorry ban through the centre of East Ardsley is flouted many times daily.

Large numbers of houses have been built down the Falls with more to come. This has already adversely impacted on Main Street which leads to the A650. The parking outside the school across the residents' drives already causes concern.

I suggest that the 3 developments at New Lane, Churchfields and Fall Lane are unsustainable. Brownfield sites should be used first such as the old clinic behind East Ardsley library and the special school site on Westerton Road, then small sites containing 20 to 50 houses which will be integrated easier into the community. The 350 houses proposed for Churchfields and New Lane would flood an already overcrowded village.

The A650 is a designated detour from the M1 and M62 in times of emergency. It is used by HGVs and many local horse riders. It is a main route for emergency vehicles, especially the police with the new HQ so close to us. The travelling community like to use it for trotting. It is already dangerously oversubscribed.

Looking at the overall picture of Morley there are areas which do not seem to suffer from urban sprawl eg. Gildersome.

Name: Julie Scott

Representor No: PRS00891

Representation ID: REP02913 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley - Green to Red

Additional housing would overload existing infrastructure

Noise level would increase to a very high level

Proposed new development has not been coordinated with neighbouring planning authorities

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2128

Housing

New Lane, East Ardsley

Name: D Devaney

Representor No: PRS00896

Representation ID: REP02921 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley - Green to Red

Additional housing would overload existing infrastructure.

Proposed new development has not been coordinated with neighbouring planning authorities

Name: Janet Ward

Representor No: PRS01109

Representation ID: REP03182 Question Ref: H1

2128

Totally unsuitable to build on this site as the infrastructure cannot cope with current demands from the existing population. When there are incidents on the nearby motorways our roads immediately become gridlocked. Waiting lists for healthcare provision can be up to 3 weeks for a preferred doctor. The school is already at capacity and at school run times the roads are dangerously congested. This site is farmland and provides beautiful open space between built up areas. It is a breeding ground for skylarks and yellowhammer birds, both red listed farmland birds. Brown sites should be used first.

For the same reasons as above this land should not be developed. The roads, Main Street, Moor Knoll, A650 are all heavily congested at peak times and very busy the rest of the day. Getting out onto the A650 is a logistical nightmare. Adding to the traffic would make life unbearable and make this road very dangerous. Have these proposed developments been co-ordinated with neighbouring local authorities?

Name: A V Jarvis

Representor No: PRS01112

Representation ID: REP03164 Question Ref: H1

2128 - 48 houses - Green to Red (assumed)

Site lies between New Lane (a cul de sac entered from Moor Knoll Lane) and New Lane (a bridle way and footpath between Moor Knoll Lane and the A650 near to the traffic lights at Amblers Mill).

Comment in Site Allocations Plan Vol. 2.10 Outer South West is "no highway issues raised."

Both New Lanes exit onto Moor Knoll Lane which has poor access onto both Main Street at the end and Common Lane at the other end. Main street is very busy from the new development at Ardsley Sidings and Fall Lane (over 400 houses and the infants school which leads to excessive parking on both Main Street and Moor Knoll Lane.

The bridle way exiting onto the A650 near to the traffic lights at Amblers Mill (Country Baskets) would make more traffic problems worse at an already problem crossing.

In addition to the traffic problems this development would add to the problems of local schools which are already over subscribed.

Surely this cannot be considered sustainable with its negative impact on local residents and is contrary to aims expressed in 1.1 and 1.2 Site Allocations Plan Vol.1 Plan overview (see comment above 84237)

Name: R & D Evans

Representor No: PRS01125

Representation ID: REP03197 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley - Green to Red

Additional housing would overload the existing infrastructure

Proposed development has not been coordinated with neighbouring planning authorities.

Name: David Watson

Representor No: PRS01128

Representation ID: REP03202 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley - Green to Red

Additional housing would overload existing infrastructure

Proposed development has not been coordinated with neighbouring planning authorities.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2128

Housing

New Lane, East Ardsley

Name: Anne Webster

Representor No: PRS01159

Representation ID: REP03245 Question Ref: H1

1032 - Land of Bradford Road, East Ardsley - Green to Red
2128 - New Lane, East Ardsley - Green to Red
Additional housing would overload infrastructure.
Proposed development has not been coordinated with neighbouring local authorities.
In Green Belt
Should use site better suited to housing.
Too much on schools, doctors surgeries and traffic.

Name: Scothern

Representor No: PRS01504

Representation ID: REP03643 Question Ref: H1

2128 - New Lane East ardsley Green to Red Additional housing would overload existing infrastructure. Proposed new development has not been co-ordinated with neighbouring local authorities.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2128

Housing

New Lane, East Ardsley

Name: Glennis Haigh

Representor No: PRS01748

Representation ID: REP00939 Question Ref: H1

It would cause too much congestion on A650 and surrounding roads. There is not adequate infrastructure - schools are full, Doctor's are full. There are inadequate bus services.

Representation ID: REP03911 Question Ref: H1

1032 / 2128 -

As a group we are volunteers who represent the people who live and/or work in East Ardsley. As such we would like to express our opinions on the Local Development Framework and how it will affect the people of this area. First of all we are concerned for the loss of green belt. We have had a considerable amount of building in the area and if our remaining farm land is used for houses our children will be deprived of 'breathing space' between developments. Looking at the types of green space we can see there is very little in our Ward. We have a recreation ground, a very small children's playground and an amateur football field. The amenity green space is largely bordering alongside the railway and although we understand this is being developed as a corridor it is not open space. A large area marked as open space audit is actually a reservoir. Our largest concern is no. 1032 (greatest potential) linking with 2128 (greatest potential) — both these sites are presently farm land and if joined to 1274 & 2155 (both currently in green belt) there would be no break at all between East Ardsley, West Ardsley and Tingley and nowhere for residents to walk in countryside and breathe fresh air.

The numbers of potential houses on these sites are frightening when you look at the present infrastructure. Our local schools are full and in fact having to have work done before September to increase this year's intake. The Nursery provision at school is also full and the waiting list expanding. Site 1032 borders onto the A650 road which is very busy and a main diversion if problems occur on the M1. As Site 527 already has planning permission and is on a bend (which includes a junction) it is difficult to see where access to the site would be made. There is a weight limit on the A650 and heavy lorries often try to turn round at this point causing major hold ups. At busy times of the day the A650 is almost impossible to turn right onto now and the extra number of cars generated by these developments would make life difficult for present and future residents. As our bus services are totally inadequate now it is not even possible to say 'use public transport'.

At the present time it is difficult to get a 'non-urgent' appointment at the Doctor's Surgery. All the medical facilities (including dentists) are very stretched and with the reducing of hours the local fire station is open as well our facilities are going to be almost non-existent. Even the queues at the local chemist sometimes leave much to be desired. We understand developers have to contribute to new infrastructure before a build begins but we know from experience this doesn't always happen. When our latest build was being approved we were promised a doctor's surgery, a chemist and a small supermarket but although the 400 houses are mostly complete (although not totally sold out) no amenities have appeared. Also if a new school and health centre had to be built, using some of the land marked for houses there would be no room for all the houses now deemed so necessary.

Drainage in the village has often been inadequate and flooding can occur. This would surely be worse when fields are replaced by concrete roads and streets. As you will appreciate we are very concerned that our 'village' will become part of a sprawl of houses and will lose the character we are used to and love. We will be grateful if you take these points into consideration when approving the finished development plan and we much appreciate 1032 being taken out of 'greatest potential' if at all possible.

Representation ID: REP00939 Question Ref: H5

1032, 2128, 2155, 1143F - All schools are full and Doctor's also full. Not enough open space in village. The houses built in the village in recent years have not all been sold so do not consider more are needed in the near future.

Representation ID: REP00939 Question Ref: H2

1032 and 2128 - No space between villages would be left - all green space filled. The main reason is lack of infrastructure - schools all full, Doctor's full, roads full. A650 not suitable for further traffic and there is inadequate public transport.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2128

Housing

New Lane, East Ardsley

Name: Caroline Proctor

Representor No: PRS02096

Representation ID: REP04315 Question Ref: H9

2128 – This site is adjacent to green belt land and is accessed by two public footpaths / bridleways.

Representation ID: REP04315 Question Ref: H2

2128 – This site is adjacent to green belt land. It also banks onto a public footpath. As far as I see from the map access to this site would mean getting rid of the public foot / bridleway. 48 houses would also create a lot of traffic onto Moor Knoll Lane, which is not very wide and has a dangerous bend. It is also part of a bus route which could cause problems.

Name: Eric Smith

Representor No: PRS02147

Representation ID: REP04370 Question Ref: H1

1032 / 2128 [this is assumed, respondent wrote 2228 but this isn't a site.. 2128 and 1032 are joined] –

I am a totally blind guide dog owner (as is my wife). We currently have two guide dogs and two retired guide dogs in our house, nearby the mentioned sites. We have been trained to use the proposed site for free running our dogs. You can imagine that two blind people and four dogs is not easy to manage anyway, but building on this site will make it virtually impossible to take them for a walk.

When we chose a location to buy a house, we considered local facilities, the local area spaces and how many people resided in the area; as a blind couple (close to retirement) who have guide dogs, these considerations were vital. With the changes proposed, we would be unable to cope getting around the village, using amenities and using our guide dogs. These changes would make us feel it is impossible to live here. Guide dogs association consider our local area before allocating us with our dogs, they may not find the new locality suitable for the dogs we already have. The general pressure on local infrastructure is already bursting at the seams in East Ardsley, e.g on the roads Moor Knoll Lane, Bradford Road (A650) and Common Lane are always traffic jammed. Also, local families can't find spaces in local primary and secondary schools. Getting a doctor's appointment can take up to four weeks. By bringing in a further 500 households I think life in East Ardsley will become unbearable.

Name: Anita Rose

Representor No: PRS02157

Representation ID: REP04381 Question Ref: H1

1032 / 2128 –

East Ardsley school is full and Thorpe too, and not big enough to take more children.

The roads in and around the building sites (Church fields) are too busy with traffic – in and out of the village and using the main Bradford Road which has many queues daily at school times and from motorway closures. Children in Ardsley and Thorpe have already to travel to other schools as they can't get in at their nearest.

Building on these sites will devalue my home having a building site at its doorstep and I don't want to live next to a noisy dusty building site for a number of years to come. With only a view of scaffolding, wagons and more houses which over the years has made my home feel surrounded and boxed in by previous builds.

Building work on the railway sidings in East Ardsley is still underway with still many more houses there to come which are not selling very well and progress is slow. Why build more when sites are still on going and not finished. Also on these sites we were promised a doctors surgery, a public house, a day care nursery, shops but haven't been given any of these only houses where people have no facilities and have to travel by car making the village busier for everything they need, e.g. shops, school, doctors.

Name: Hazel Rennison

Representor No: PRS02213

Representation ID: REP04448 Question Ref: H1

2128 –

1.Access onto Moor Knoll Lane would be dangerous. Very narrow road. Bad bends.

2.Facilities as above. Schools / health centre / shops not adequate.

3.Very little green space in the area.

4.Ancient footpath and hedges on this area.

Name: Lisa Pounder

Representor No: PRS02300

Representation ID: REP04544 Question Ref: H1

2128 – New Lane

More houses on this site will mean more cars. Traffic is already congested and the village school is already oversubscribed. My neighbour's children have to drive to another school that is a few miles away. There is only one medical facility to cover a few villages. It can take a few weeks to get to see a doctor. Traffic on Fall Lane is already like a race course. I'm surprised no one has been killed yet. The Speed limit is 30 mph but cars are much faster. The roads here were built for smaller communities not for large estates.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2128

Housing

New Lane, East Ardsley

Name: Maureen Tall

Representor No: PRS02410

Representation ID: REP04668 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane

A part from the issues already raised above, the school is already over-subscribed and local children are having to go far afield to other village schools. I am concerned that houses built on New Lane will impact on the traffic n Fall Lane, which can be very busy and the junction at Queen Street is difficult to cross with cars speeding and the bend in the road, and the brow of the hill (with cars parked).

Name: John & Christine Armitage

Representor No: PRS02443

Representation ID: REP04707 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane East Ardsley Change suggested Green to Red Reason for Change Additional housing would overload the infrastructure Other remarks Proposed new development has not been co-ordinated with neighbouring local authorities

Name: Victoria Mann

Representor No: PRS02625

Representation ID: REP04930 Question Ref: H1

I object to this development, the school & surrounding infrastructure cannot sustain any further development.

Name: Neil Brittlebank

Representor No: PRS02657

Representation ID: REP05105 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane E/A

Simply an extension of the 1032 site. The same problems exists in this case also which are;
With East Ardsley sited at the junction of two major motorways, M1 & M62, we feel we need some lungs, and green fields. This site is one of the last remaining green areas in our village. Doctor's surgeries are already over flowing and we understand that the local primary/nursery schools are full to capacity. The extra traffic generated by more housing would cause chaos in the village, accidents waiting to happen perhaps!

Name: Maureen Brittlebank

Representor No: PRS02661

Representation ID: REP05111 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane E/A

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2128

Housing

New Lane, East Ardsley

Name: Andrea Cosgrove

Representor No: PRS02693

Representation ID: REP05148 Question Ref: H1

Please read comments for the Church Fields site as above, as they are the exact same reasons for also not building on New Lane. I would also be very interested to know what percentage of new houses are being built and have been built over the last 30 years in South Leeds compared to North Leeds where the richer people live including you councillors.

Representation ID: REP05655 Question Ref: H7

SITE NUMBERS 1032 Church Fields and 2128 New Lane East Ardsley

I am writing to complain about the above sites being given planning permission. There is absolutely no more room in schools in East Ardsley for any more people living here, saying you will put money aside as from 2014 is a complete joke, just like the previous planning permission that was allowed on Buckthornes in East Ardsley telling people that old peoples bungalows will be built there?? when did that ever happen?? Just like the joke that is the community centre that knocked down the Old Mans Shelter (a meeting up place for the elderly) that was supposed to have a Sports Centre built there instead. You as a council are not trusted at all by the people of East Ardsley/Tingley. There are also no room at the Doctors, having to wait 2 weeks to get an appointment is outrageous and how bad will it get with God knows how many more people living here. Not to mention it is Green Belt Land, without a place for nature to live then there will be no nature. The people of East Ardsley would like to be told what percentage of land is being given planning permission in South Leeds compared to North Leeds, Im sure you are all familiar with North Leeds, its where you and the rich all live. The council needs to start listening to what people have to say rather than lining their own pockets and looking out for themselves.

I live in [x] and am absolutely disgusted with Leeds County Council as a whole.

Name: Trevor Sherborne

Representor No: PRS02724

Representation ID: REP05437 Question Ref: H1

If both these sites go ahead where is all the infrastructure to go with them. Schools are full in the area. There is queueing traffic on the A650. These sites will bring another 300 to 500 more vehicles to the area. It will increasa in pollution. We have enough pollution in the area with M1, M62 and the A650 without this extra traffic. I note that Highways should spend some time in the area to see the real problems, not just those on paper. There are also public rights of way across these sites. These are greenfield sites

Name: Richard Ward

Representor No: PRS02867

Representation ID: REP05419 Question Ref: H1

The infrastructure can not cope currently. Additonal housing to this area would increase pressure on our already strained health, education, and road systems. Promised improved infrastructure and Parkland does not materialise as can be seen on the development where I reside

Name: June Rance

Representor No: PRS02942

Representation ID: REP05506 Question Ref: H7

We do agree with them building the new houses in all areas but we also believe that there needs to be more amenities such as doctors, dentists, schools as they are in short supply. And also a good bus service to get in and around the community

Name: John Place

Representor No: PRS02980

Representation ID: REP05545 Question Ref: H1

The above sites are all on the A650 route ex Junction 41 of M1 to tingley junction 28 M62. This road is extremely congested during daylight hours at present. Accidents on the M1/M62 occur frequently - A650 is further congested. Speed limit at 40mph is dangerous.. Many homes already access direct to major road. Developments in Middleton/Thorpe already have increased traffic flow. Schoools are in overflow and no plans to build more have been mentioned. Even at less busy periods. I object strongly to all the proposed developments

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2128

Housing

New Lane, East Ardsley

Name: William Ward

Representor No: PRS03001

Representation ID: REP05571 Question Ref: H1

2128 –

As above [see 1032 comment]

-Difficult access – either to Moor Knoll Land or A650.

Name: Richard Marshall

Representor No: PRS03170

Representation ID: REP01024 Question Ref: H2

1079, 1072, 1077, 1143B, 1143D, 1171B, 1200A, 1258, 1284a, 1285, 1344, 2098a, 3365, 3456A. All these sites are green belt sites, green belt land is there to stop urban sprawl and the destruction of the countryside that still remains in this area. If sites 1143B, 1143D, 1143F, 2155, 1274, 1032, and 2128 are built on East Ardsley West Ardsley and Tingley will just become one built up area hemmed in by the M62. Not all of these are greenbelt sites but if the development is allowed the basic principal of having greenbelt in this area will be completely wrecked!

Name: David Florence

Representor No: PRS03515

Representation ID: REP01088 Question Ref: H1

Ex coal mine, prone to flooding and possible subsidence

Representation ID: REP01088 Question Ref: H2

2128 for the above reason (Ex coal mine, prone to flooding and possible subsidence)

Name: Nicola Baylis

Representor No: PRS03747

Representation ID: REP00059 Question Ref: H2

1032 and 2128 see reasoning above.

Name: Mark Brennan

Representor No: PRS03782

Representation ID: REP01655 Question Ref: H1

With numerous disused brownfield sites within the "outer south west" area it seems unbelievable that consideration is being given to the development of greenfield sites. The reason given by Leeds City Council that the brownfield sites are not to be developed is that remedial works would be too expensive. Should this be the case, it would suggest that these sites are heavily contaminated and pose a potential risk to human health and controlled waters. On this basis I would enquire why these sites are not being investigated as potential "Part 2A" sites. I feel it would make more sense developing the brownfield sites prior to targetting greenfield sites, as the risk and treatment of ground contamination is simply being ignored and delayed. Brownfield sites identified include but not limited to 2117, 2096, 2096A, 2096B, 2096C, 3075

Representation ID: REP01655 Question Ref: H5

1032 and 2128. as detailed earlier existing infrastructure, more specifically highways (Bradford Road), would not be able to support an increase in the volume of traffic.

Representation ID: REP01655 Question Ref: H2

1032, 2128, both located within East Ardsley Existing local infrastructure, including highways, could not support the development of these areas for residential end-use. Bradford Road, between the M62 and M1 junctions, during peak times is often busy and grid locked due to the volume of traffic. The introduction of more residential properties within this area would simply worsen this situation.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2128

Housing

New Lane, East Ardsley

Name: Lisa Jackson

Representor No: PRS04076

Representation ID: REP01267 Question Ref: H9

YesSite ref 1032 - Fields off Bradford Road, East ArdsleySuggested change - green to redReason - The current infrastructure in East Ardsley already cannot cope with the current population. The school is already full, with siblings of existing pupils already unable to gain a place at the same school. Local doctors surgeries no longer accept new patients from East Ardsley. The A650 Bradford Road already struggles to cope with the volume of traffic, with regular lengthy queues at various traffic lights in and around East Ardsley, which are particularly bad during morning and afternoon rush hours. Traffic actually grinds to a halt on the A650 when there are problems on the nearby motorway networks causing traffic to divert to avoid motorway delays. Further development would mean that there is strong likelihood that the current infrastructure would collapse under the pressure of an increase in population and traffic. In the case of this site specifically, access via New Lane would be impractical and potentially illegal as there is a footpath between this site and New Lane which must not be crossed by a road. New Lane is not capable of supporting any increase in the volume of traffic. The road surface is in very poor condition with a number of recurring potholes requiring regular attention. New Lane is already significantly narrowed by multiple vehicles parked on the roadside, this is already a hazard, hindering access for the emergency services to properties and people at the far end of New Lane.Site ref 2128 - Field adjacent to New Lane, East ArdsleySuggested change - green to redReason - The current infrastructure in East Ardsley already cannot cope with the current population. The school is already full, with siblings of existing pupils already unable to gain a place at the same school. Local doctors surgeries no longer accept new patients from East Ardsley. The A650 Bradford Road already struggles to cope with the volume of traffic, with regular lengthy queues at various traffic lights in and around East Ardsley, which are particularly bad during morning and afternoon rush hours. Traffic actually grinds to a halt on the A650 when there are problems on the nearby motorway networks causing traffic to divert to avoid motorway delays. Further development would mean that there is strong likelihood that the current infrastructure would collapse under the pressure of an increase in population and traffic. In the case of this site specifically, New Lane is not capable of supporting any increase in the volume of traffic. The road surface is in very poor condition with a number of recurring potholes requiring regular attention. New Lane is already significantly narrowed by multiple vehicles parked on the roadside, this is already a hazard, hindering access for the emergency services to properties and people at the far end of New Lane.

Representation ID: REP01267 Question Ref: General comment

I offer an open invitation for Leeds City Council representatives to come and meet us in our home to see for themselves the impact that developments at site 1032 and 2128 would have on us, our neighbours, our lane and our village. I look forward to seeing you.

Representation ID: REP01267 Question Ref: H2

Site ref 1032 - Fields off Bradford Road, East ArdsleySuggested change - green to redReason - The current infrastructure in East Ardsley already cannot cope with the current population. The school is already full, with siblings of existing pupils already unable to gain a place at the same school. Local doctors surgeries no longer accept new patients from East Ardsley. The A650 Bradford Road already struggles to cope with the volume of traffic, with regular lengthy queues at various traffic lights in and around East Ardsley, which are particularly bad during morning and afternoon rush hours. Traffic actually grinds to a halt on the A650 when there are problems on the nearby motorway networks causing traffic to divert to avoid motorway delays. Further development would mean that there is strong likelihood that the current infrastructure would collapse under the pressure of an increase in population and traffic. In the case of this site specifically, access via New Lane would be impractical and potentially illegal as there is a footpath between this site and New Lane which must not be crossed by a road. New Lane is not capable of supporting any increase in the volume of traffic. The road surface is in very poor condition with a number of recurring potholes requiring regular attention. New Lane is already significantly narrowed by multiple vehicles parked on the roadside, this is already a hazard, hindering access for the emergency services to properties and people at the far end of New Lane.Site ref 2128 - Field adjacent to New Lane, East ArdsleySuggested change - green to redReason - The current infrastructure in East Ardsley already cannot cope with the current population. The school is already full, with siblings of existing pupils already unable to gain a place at the same school. Local doctors surgeries no longer accept new patients from East Ardsley. The A650 Bradford Road already struggles to cope with the volume of traffic, with regular lengthy queues at various traffic lights in and around East Ardsley, which are particularly bad during morning and afternoon rush hours. Traffic actually grinds to a halt on the A650 when there are problems on the nearby motorway networks causing traffic to divert to avoid motorway delays. Further development would mean that there is strong likelihood that the current infrastructure would collapse under the pressure of an increase in population and traffic. In the case of this site specifically, New Lane is not capable of supporting any increase in the volume of traffic. The road surface is in very poor condition with a number of recurring potholes requiring regular attention. New Lane is already significantly narrowed by multiple vehicles parked on the roadside, this is already a hazard, hindering access for the emergency services to properties and people at the far end of New Lane.

Name: Pamela Caveen

Representor No: PRS04212

Representation ID: REP00768 Question Ref: H1

Many of the sites are in the Ardsley area. While I agree there is undeveloped land here which may be suitable for housing, there are a number of infrastructure problems in the area which would need to be looked at first before any further housing was built.

Representation ID: REP00768 Question Ref: H2

1032, 2128,1143D, 143B stand out. All these sites would need access onto the A650. This road is already congested at peak times and very busy for much of the day. Any increase in traffic due to further residential development would only create more problems for existing residents. Another point which also has implications for the volume of traffic, is that schools in the area are full. Parents have to travel further with their children, often in their cars, adding to the congestion and making the areas around the schools quite dangerous. The roads around East Ardsley and Westerton Primary schools are an obstacle course at school finishing times. Certain other spots are also a problem at times, for example the approach to the Esso filling station/Tesco store.In addition to my concerns about traffic, the medical practice at Leigh View does not seem to be coping with present demands. Although one can usually get a short appointment within a reasonable time, with a duty doctor, the waiting time for a longer appointment, particularly with a doctor of your choice, can be two weeks or more. Nor are there any NHS dental services in the immediate area.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2128

Housing

New Lane, East Ardsley

Name: Paul Whittleston

Representor No: PRS04278

Representation ID: REP01470 Question Ref: H2

Numbers 527, 1032 and 2128 The Tesco is not a big enough site for the amount of vehicles which use it, causing queues out onto the main road, cars also park on Bradford Road, Cherry Tree Walk, Woodlands and Brayshaw Road near to the junctions making it extremely difficult to navigate these areas safely, either in a vehicle or on foot. To compound this problem there is a bus stop outside the Tesco and one directly across the road. Cherry Tree Walk is already used as a shortcut in both directions building more houses in these areas will only increase the amount of traffic adding to these issues. I know it is not in the Leeds area but there is a large development of Police buildings under construction at Carr Gate JN41 which will also increase the traffic flow! I realise that the houses need to be built somewhere and I don't really have issue with this, BUT it is essential that before planning is approved the roads and problems are looked at and solutions put in place. I have not even mentioned the problems which more people will cause with the Doctors, Dentists and Schools who are already struggling to cope.

Name: Michael Jackson

Representor No: PRS04707

Representation ID: REP01319 Question Ref: General comment

I offer an open invitation for Leeds City Council representatives to come and meet us in our home to see for themselves the impact that developments at site 1032 and 2128 would have on us, our neighbours, our lane and our village. I look forward to seeing you.

Name: Andrea Jarvis

Representor No: PRS04757

Representation ID: REP01155 Question Ref: H3

1032 - Change from green to RED Additional housing would overload even more an already overloaded infrastructure. Severe school issues would also impact on residents, doctors, dentists overloaded, roads in poor repair with severe congestion. Lack of co-ordination with other local authorities. Degrading our village for current residents, removing our right to open spaces, footpaths, bridleways and creating a concrete village. Change from Green to RED! 2128 - Change from green to RED Additional housing would overload even more an already overloaded infrastructure. Severe school issues would also impact on residents, doctors, dentists overloaded, roads in poor repair with severe congestion. Lack of co-ordination with other local authorities. Degrading our village for current residents, removing our right to open spaces, footpaths, bridleways and creating a concrete village. Change from Green to RED!

Representation ID: REP01155 Question Ref: H9

1032 and 2128 Additional housing would overload even more an already overloaded infrastructure. Severe school issues would also impact on residents, doctors, dentists overloaded, roads in poor repair with severe congestion. Lack of co-ordination with other local authorities. Degrading our village for current residents, removing our right to open spaces, footpaths, bridleways and creating a concrete village. Change from Green to RED!

Representation ID: REP01155 Question Ref: H2

1032 - Land off Bradford Road, East Ardsley Additional housing would overload even more an already overloaded infrastructure. Severe school issues would also impact on residents, doctors, dentists overloaded, roads in poor repair with severe congestion. Lack of co-ordination with other local authorities. Degrading our village for current residents, removing our right to open spaces, footpaths, bridleways and creating a concrete village. Change from Green to RED! 2128 - New Lane East Ardsley Additional housing would overload even more an already overloaded infrastructure. Severe school issues would also impact on residents, doctors, dentists overloaded, roads in poor repair with severe congestion. Lack of co-ordination with other local authorities. Degrading our village for current residents, removing our right to open spaces, footpaths, bridleways and creating a concrete village. Change from Green to RED!

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2128

Housing

New Lane, East Ardsley

Name: Claire Smith

Representor No: PRS04893

Representation ID: REP01576 Question Ref: H5

My main concern relates to the available schooling for all these new families. I have a pre-school child and am already concerned that she might not get in to the local primary school (East Ardsley) due to high-demand - this became apparent in March of this year (2013) when we were told that there weren't enough nursery places and that she would have to wait until September 2013 and then she still might not get one. I am aware of plans to extend East Ardsley Primary school but this is to accommodate the current demand never mind the addition of the proposed developments (specifically 1032 and 2128). If there was more consideration to schooling within the area then these site would be more appealing to existing residents

Representation ID: REP01576 Question Ref: H6

Sites 1032 and 2128 should of been amber instead of green (same reason as questions H5 above)

Representation ID: REP01576 Question Ref: H2

Sites 2128 and 1032. Adding housing to this particular part of East Ardsley would have a considerable impact on the available schools. I am aware that East Ardsley Primary school is already expanding yet this is to accommodate the current population and therefore the addition of extra housing without any plans to build another school is quite frankly apauling

Name: Stuart Perkins Kendell

Representor No: PRS04909

Representation ID: REP01206 Question Ref: H2

Sites 1032 and 2128The local community is already struggling in terms of essential services due to existing over crowding. The present infrastructure is way beyond full capacity. It would be ludicrous and furthermore completely unacceptable to even think of building any houses on these two sites.I feel the way this has been conducted is underhanded and somewhat insidious since no real consideration has been given to the disruption this would cause or the feelings of the local community. The existing overcrowding is already causing extremely long delays for GP appointments with many patients having to wait two to three weeks to see a doctor. More people equals longer waits.Traffic is also a significant problem and Bradford Road has become more dangerous than it used to be with the increased volume of cars. Building homes on site 1032 and site 2128 would be irresponsible and reckless and potentially put lives at risk.A disturbing fact is that there are other sites around South Leeds which could be used for new homes as well as sites in North Leeds. It seems rather discriminatory that it's only South Leeds which has been targeted with such an unpleasant proposal. All these new homes will undoubtedly attract an element of noise and crime which will severely impose on the quality of life which most of us have enjoyed for over 30 years.This is a development which CANNOT be allowed to materialise!

Name: Margaret Cosgrove

Representor No: PRS05049

Representation ID: REP05617 Question Ref: H1

New lane East Ardsley is not suitable for the amount of traffic already using the road. It is too narrow; there is not a suitable footpath in certain spots. i.e. (Common Lane) buses already have trouble when passing cars. Also its Green Belt so should not be built on.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2128

Housing

New Lane, East Ardsley

Name: Helen Fawcett

Representor No: PRS05088

Representation ID: REP05660 Question Ref: H1

I along with my family live at 88 forsythia Avenue, East Ardsley and I write to you with real concerns around the proposed development of Church field off the A650 and fields off Old New Lane as part of the LDF.

I do not believe the plans for these green fields sites are suitable or sustainable.

Traffic on the A650 is already very heavy and it is some times very difficult to pull out from Cherry tree and other roads off the A650. With another 500 homes planned for Church field alone this is going to make this situation even worse. The A650 is often used as rat run when there is an accident on the M62 or M1 resulting in the complete deadlock of the road.

The rain water run off for Church field is into Old New Lane, the position of our house could be detrimentally affected if Church field is covered in concrete as our house is below that of the field.

The fire service has been in attendance due to flooding on Moor Knoll Lane as a result of this run off. This has resulted in the closure of Moor Knoll Lane.

The local schools are already at capacity so most certainly do not have the capacity to cope with additional demand that is sure to result from the building of these homes.

The public transport for East Ardsley is appalling leaving residents with no alternative but to use their cars meaning more traffic on the local roads.

Driving around Morley you don't have to look hard to see more suitable sites that are brown rather than green field. Timber Tops, a property that resides on Forsythia Avenue is a prime example of this. It is a brown field site prime for development but has sat derelict since we moved here 7 Years ago.

The proposed new development has not been coordinated with neighbouring local authorities.

Our children will be the ones who will inherit this legacy of build build build and once we have built on these green sites it will be impossible to turn back the clock. We are going to end up with super cities with no green divide between different populations. Also, due to the high density of these new developments they are not going to be pleasant environments to live in.

Ultimately I do not believe the reason given for the development. I don't believe that there is not enough homes already out there when there is a quoted 500k empty homes left abandoned around the country. I believe this is a way government can keep the building industry moving.

I fear that we are at some time in the future going to end up with ghost estates which are left abandoned because the supposed demand is not actually there.

Name: Rob Onions

Representor No: PRS05089

Representation ID: REP05658 Question Ref: H1

I along with my family live at [x] and I write to you with real concerns around the proposed development of Church field off the A650 and fields off Old New Lane as part of the LDF.

I do not believe the plans for these green fields sites are suitable or sustainable.

Traffic on the A650 is already very heavy and it is some times very difficult to pull out from Cherry tree and other roads off the A650. With another 500 homes planned for Church field alone this is going to make this situation even worse. The A650 is often used as rat run when there is an accident on the M62 or M1 resulting in the complete deadlock of the road.

The rain water run off for Church field is into Old New Lane, the position of our house could be detrimentally affected if Church field is covered in concrete as our house is below that of the field.

The fire service has been in attendance due to flooding on Moor Knoll Lane as a result of this run off. This has resulted in the closure of Moor Knoll Lane.

The local schools are already at capacity so most certainly do not have the capacity to cope with additional demand that is sure to result from the building of these homes.

The public transport for East Ardsley is appalling leaving residents with no alternative but to use their cars meaning more traffic on the local roads.

Driving around Morley you don't have to look hard to see more suitable sites that are brown rather than green field. Timber Tops, a property that resides on Forsythia Avenue is a prime example of this. It is a brown field site prime for development but has sat derelict since we moved here 7 Years ago.

The proposed new development has not been coordinated with neighbouring local authorities.

Our children will be the ones who will inherit this legacy of build build build and once we have built on these green sites it will be impossible to turn back the clock. We are going to end up with super cities with no green divide between different populations. Also, due to the high density of these new developments they are not going to be pleasant environments to live in.

Ultimately I do not believe the reason given for the development. I don't believe that there is not enough homes already out there when there is a quoted 500k empty homes left abandoned around the country. I believe this is a way government can keep the building industry moving.

I fear that we are at some time in the future going to end up with ghost estates which are left abandoned because the supposed demand is not actually there.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2128

Housing

New Lane, East Ardsley

Name: Deighton

Representor No: PRS05408

Representation ID: REP06012 Question Ref: H1

THIS IS A FORMAL REQUEST TO LEEDS CITY COUNCIL OFFICERS DEALING WITH THE LDF SITE ALLOCATION PLAN TO NOTE THE FOLLOWING SUGGESTED CHANGES

NUMBER OF SITE - 1032

NAME OR LOCATION OF SITE - Land off Bradford Road, East Ardsley

CHANGE SUGGESTED - Green to red

REASON FOR CHANGE - Additional housing would overload existing infrastructure

OTHER REMARKS ABOUT THE SITE - Proposed new development has not been coordinated with neighbouring planning authorities

NUMBER OF SITE - 2128

NAME OR LOCATION OF SITE - New Lane, East Ardsley

CHANGE SUGGESTED - Green to red

REASON FOR CHANGE - Additional housing would overload existing infrastructure

OTHER REMARKS ABOUT THE SITE - Proposed new development has not been coordinated with neighbouring planning authorities

Name: Julia Webb

Representor No: PRS05420

Representation ID: REP06027 Question Ref: H1

2128

Green to red. Additional housing would overload existing infrastructure. Proposed new development has not been coordinated with neighbouring planning authorities.

With regards to two potential planning applications for new housing on plots of land to the rear of my property. We believe this would significantly destroy a large area of land and wildlife, decrease the value of our property due to restricted views which are currently interrupted views across the fields to the rear of our property, and increase unnecessary burden to existing infrastructure in this area. There is currently too much residential housing in proportion to the amount of local amenities available. If this housing application went ahead, we would rather move out of the area as I am sure most other residents would.

Name: Lisa Mulherin

Representor No: PRS05734

Representation ID: REP07126 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley – This is a relatively sustainable level of development, but the local school and GP's surgery is at capacity. Moor Knoll Lane is essentially a country lane which would not cope with a much greater volume of traffic and there are already significant traffic and access problems at the school end of the road.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2128

Housing

New Lane, East Ardsley

Name: Taylor Wimpey

Representor No: PRS05758

Representation ID: REP07282 Question Ref: H1

2128 – New Lane, East Ardsley

We support the rating of site 2128, New Lane, East Ardsley as green. We believe that the site should be allocated for housing in the Site Allocations Plan. Taylor Wimpey are committed to delivering housing on this site. The site comprises of five fields to the north of residential development on New Lane and to the west of Moor Knoll Lane. The site is generally flat with trees acting as field boundaries throughout the site. It is currently designated as Protected Area of Search in the Leeds UDPR. The surrounding land uses are residential to the south and agricultural to the west, north and east beyond Moor Knoll Lane. Part of the northern boundary of the site abuts Sharp Business Systems offices which are located off Moor Knoll Lane. The site is on the outer north western edge of East Ardsley. In terms of local services, there is a Co-operative store 750m from the site, and a Post Office 650m from the site. There are also community facilities in East Ardsley including a Library 700m from the site and recreation ground 300m from the site and local churches. There are two main pubs in East Ardsley, The Bay Horse and The Bedford Arms along with Working Men's Clubs. The nearest large supermarket is Sainsburys at the White Rose Centre, 3.8km away and ADSA, 9km away.

The site has good access to public transport, education and local health facilities. The site is approximately 4.1 km away from Morley Train Station, where there are services to Leeds, Huddersfield and Manchester Victoria. Outwood Train Station is also 2.4km away, which is on the Wakefield line and offers services to Leeds, Doncaster and Sheffield.

Bus stops are located on Moor Knoll Lane on the eastern edge of the site where the following services can be accessed:

- 85 – Bramley Shopping Centre to Morley Town Hall via Leeds every hour
- 153 – Morley Town Hall to Castleford Bus Station via Rothwell every hour
- 481 – Leeds City Bus Station to Wakefield Bus Station every hour

This site offers excellent access to the motorway network, it lying in between M1 Junction 41 (1.3km away), M62 Junction 28 (2.4km away) and M62 Junction 29 (1.9km away).

This site is well placed to access local educational facilities. The nearest Primary Schools are East Ardsley Primary School which is 470m away, Blackgates Primary School which is 1.6km away and Thorpe Primary School, 1.3m away. The nearest Secondary Schools are Outwood Grange Academy which is 2.8km away and Woodkirk Academy which is 2.9km away.

With regard to health facilities; the closest is East Ardsley Health Centre, which is approximately 650m from the site followed by Leigh View Medical Practice which is 1.1km away. The closest dental surgery is The Dental Studio and is 800m away, followed by Lingwell Croft Surgery and Boyds Dental Practice both in Middleton. There are two opticians within 700m of the site along Bradford Road and a chemist 1.1km up Bradford Road.

The site is close to the "Strategic Location for Jobs Growth (1000 + FTE jobs)" as identified in the draft Core Strategy which is approximately 2.4km away at Junction 28 of the M62. This strategic area for jobs growth needs to be matched with new housing in easily accessible locations. This site off New Lane and Moor Knoll Lane can already access J28 of the M62 easily using regular local bus services, therefore this site provides an ideal location for housing growth. The site is 1.9km away from a wide range of job opportunities at the Junction 41 Business Park.

[Representation sets out Core Strategy policies].

This site is designated as Protected Area of Search for long term development in the Leeds UDP Review (2006). The housing distribution by housing market characteristic area for Outer South West is 7,200 which is 11% of the total housing requirement for the Leeds district. The Outer South West housing market contains the major settlement of Morley and smaller settlements of Drighlington, East Ardsley, Gildersome and Tingley/West Ardsley. Therefore it can be expected that those sites located closest to the existing services and facilities in these settlements will be allocated to meet this housing requirement.

In Outer South West the Draft Core Strategy apportion 7,200 dwellings as being required throughout the plan period. Regardless of our objections to the overall housing requirement, Outer South West has outstanding permissions and allocations equating to 1,398 dwellings, this is only 19% of the requirement. The total number of 'Green' sites in this housing market area has a capacity for 4,214 dwellings, some 58% of the requirement. Based on this, it is clear that the Council will need to allocate all the identified 'Green' sites in the Outer South West market area in order to achieve the dwelling requirement.

The allocation of this site for housing development is consistent with the adopted National Planning Policy Framework. [Representation sets out NPPF policy]. The development of the site is consistent with these objectives.

Conclusions

The site has the potential to deliver circa 100 dwellings, given its site size of 3.8ha. We question the indicative capacity in the Council's SHLAA, which refers to a site capacity of 48 units. The site is deliverable when considered against the definition of deliverable in the Framework (footnote 11 of paragraph 47). The site has a strong likelihood of early delivery as Taylor Wimpey have agreed promotional terms with a number of the landowners. The site is available, achievable and developable in the short term. In terms of the site being suitable, there are no physical problems or limitations such as access, infrastructure, ground conditions, flood risk, hazard risks, pollution or contamination and as such, the site is considered to be suitable for housing. With regard to availability, Taylor Wimpey have a number of agreements in place with the landowners and understand all owners are keen to develop. In terms of delivery, detailed technical assessments relating to the site have been undertaken and there are no viability issues pertaining to bringing the site forward. There are a number of social, economic and environmental benefits that could arise from the development of this site. These include:

- Delivery of new housing of a mix to meet local needs including affordable housing
- New public open space
- Direct and indirect construction jobs
- S106 money towards local infrastructure
- New Homes Bonus
- Increased expenditure into the local economy

The site is well contained with strong connections to the urban area and is an ideal candidate for a housing allocation. The Outer South West housing market area has the capacity for further housing growth and sites such as this which is close to local facilities, services and public transport will be necessary to be allocated for housing development in order to meet the housing requirements for this housing market area. It is considered that the development of this site would constitute sustainable development with no significant adverse impact and a range of benefits. Therefore for the reasons set out above we support the housing allocation of site reference 2128 land at New Lane, East Ardsley.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2128

Housing

New Lane, East Ardsley

Name: Karen Renshaw

Representor No: PRS06048

Representation ID: REP06876 Question Ref: H1

2128 – New Lane, East Ardsley. This development for 48 properties would create a ratrun ,along with dangerous highways and once again, no school places. Some of the land is currently used to keep horses and therefore the animal welfare would suffer as a consequence of this development you are proposing.. The access point would cross with industrial access/delivery and the village identity would become a blur and the open environment which once was would been seen to be disappearing.. Too condensed and no school places available within this side of the city . This would take away the country walks and the opportunities for residents to walk to areas locally. This route/site is used by blind and disabled residents within the village which would lose its local character .

Many of the reasons for opposing all these sites identified are based on the lack of infrastructure, schools & education, transport, safety , health & well-being, Gp's surgeries, poor links with public transport, noise, pollution and busy highways created by the increased volume of traffic. Please take all these serious matters into account and I would appreciate a briefing before any further decisions are made.

Name: Alan Clark

Representor No: PRS06104

Representation ID: REP06968 Question Ref: H1

ref no. 1032 Church Fields and 2128 New Lane.

I don't think Moor Knoll Lane could cope with extra traffic as it stands (is it only me that meets double decker buses on the corners) I don't know what route could be considered, as Bradford road is very busy at rush hour. This is making a small village more congested. Has anyone contacted Wakefield council regarding proposed plans off the A650 near Burger King, which will also add more traffic feeding up Bradford Road through our village

Representation ID: REP06444 Question Ref: H1

ref no. 1032 Church Fields and 2128 New Lane.

I don't think Moor Knoll Lane could cope with extra traffic as it stands (is it only me that meets double decker buses on the corners) I don't know what route could be considered, as Bradford road is very busy at rush hour. This is making a small village more congested. Has anyone contacted Wakefield council regarding proposed plans off the A650 near Burger King, which will also add more traffic feeding up Bradford Road through our village.

Name: Julie Woodcock

Representor No: PRS06155

Representation ID: REP07035 Question Ref: H1

Dear sirs

i would like to raise a complaint regarding the house's on the above sites, there are no places in the schools they are all full
the doctors is over full and no apt are to be had for 2 weeks and the traffic build up on the Bradford road is excessive
it is also green belt land.

I would also be interested to know what percentage of housing is being built in South Leeds as opposed to North West and East Leeds.

I would also like to know what you will be doing about the Falls Lane Bridge in East Ardsley which is dangerous.

I will await your response,

Name: Paul Rg Haley

Representor No: PRS06480

Representation ID: REP07608 Question Ref: H1

Ref sites 1032 and 2128, land off Bradford Road and New Lane, East Ardsley

Additional housing would overload existing infrastructure. Proposed new development has not been co-ordinated with neighbouring planning authorities.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2128

Housing

New Lane, East Ardsley

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 1 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if these sites would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. Significant developer contributions will be required at these sites to improve the public transport to meet the council LDF accessibility policies; particularly in the larger sites should these be brought forward for development. These include SHLAA ref: 2062, 1032, 1046, 1017 & 1055.

Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small sites low capacity are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

The table also includes accessibility assessments results to access other services and facilities within acceptable journey times on public transport.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H1

Disagree with Council's green assessment, think the site should be amber

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H1

Disagree with Council's green assessment, think the site should be amber

Name: Gail & Ian Taylor

Representor No: PRS07147

Representation ID: REP08300 Question Ref: H1

1032 / 2128 -

Green to Red

More houses affects the schools which aren't big enough, no room in the GP surgery everywhere overloaded.

Representation ID: REP08300 Question Ref: H1

2128 -

Green to Red

Additional housing would overload existing infrastructure.

Proposed new development has not been co-ordinated with neighbouring local authorities.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2155

Housing

Ardsley Common (south of)

Name: Brian Guy

Representor No: PRS00142

Representation ID: REP04659 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04659 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Name: Wenda P Whitehead

Representor No: PRS00312

Representation ID: REP04786 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04786 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Name: Janice Beever

Representor No: PRS00441

Representation ID: REP04791 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04791 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2155

Housing

Ardsley Common (south of)

Name: P S Barrie

Representor No: PRS00915

Representation ID: REP04769 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04781 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04781 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04810 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04810 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04769 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Name: Lynne Paul

Representor No: PRS01169

Representation ID: REP04800 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04800 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2155

Housing

Ardsley Common (south of)

Name: D Paul

Representor No: PRS01183

Representation ID: REP04793 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04793 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Name: B Stringer

Representor No: PRS01606

Representation ID: REP04797 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04797 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Name: L.e Beever

Representor No: PRS01607

Representation ID: REP04804 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04804 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2155

Housing

Ardsley Common (south of)

Name: Glennis Haigh

Representor No: PRS01748

Representation ID: REP00939 Question Ref: H4

2155 and 1274 - if linked with green sites it would make the whole area built up and unacceptable. No farming fields left in the village.

Representation ID: REP03911 Question Ref: H4

Our largest concern is no. 1032 (greatest potential) linking with 2128 (greatest potential) — both these sites are presently farm land and if joined to 1274 & 2155 (both currently in green belt) there would be no break at all between East Ardsley, West Ardsley and Tingley and nowhere for residents to walk in countryside and breath fresh air

Representation ID: REP00939 Question Ref: H5

1032, 2128, 2155, 1143F - All schools are full and Doctor's also full. Not enough open space in village. The houses built in the village in recent years have not all been sold so do not consider more are needed in the near future.

Name: Caroline Proctor

Representor No: PRS02096

Representation ID: REP04315 Question Ref: H5

2155 – As this is a green belt site it shouldn't be built on and should be coded red. This land is currently used for agricultural purposes. 246 houses would have a great impact on Common Lane and access to the site would be dangerous. Common Lane does not have the capacity to cope with all this extra traffic. There could also be drainage issues with this site.

Representation ID: REP04315 Question Ref: H9

2155 – As this is green belt land it should be protected and not considered for building on.

Name: J Cowie

Representor No: PRS02227

Representation ID: REP04768 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04768 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Name: Susan Holt

Representor No: PRS02289

Representation ID: REP04772 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04772 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2155

Housing

Ardsley Common (south of)

Name: Dereck Holt

Representor No: PRS02311

Representation ID: REP04766 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04766 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Name: Jenni Davenport

Representor No: PRS02330

Representation ID: REP04770 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04770 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Name: Frank Raven

Representor No: PRS02339

Representation ID: REP04771 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04771 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2155

Housing

Ardsley Common (south of)

Name: E Naylor

Representor No: PRS02363

Representation ID: REP04780 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04780 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Name: Kathleen Paver

Representor No: PRS02372

Representation ID: REP04774 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04774 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Name: C Guy

Representor No: PRS02377

Representation ID: REP04767 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04767 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2155

Housing

Ardsley Common (south of)

Name: C Clegg

Representor No: PRS02406

Representation ID: REP04663 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04663 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Name: Doreen Gill

Representor No: PRS02496

Representation ID: REP04755 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04755 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Name: D Naylor

Representor No: PRS02497

Representation ID: REP04773 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04773 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2155

Housing

Ardsley Common (south of)

Name: A Paver

Representor No: PRS02498

Representation ID: REP04775 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04775 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Name: James Bowers

Representor No: PRS02500

Representation ID: REP04777 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04777 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Name: Alan Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02501

Representation ID: REP04778 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04778 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2155

Housing

Ardsley Common (south of)

Name: Vivienne Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02502

Representation ID: REP04779 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04779 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Name: Vivian Oxtoby

Representor No: PRS02504

Representation ID: REP04783 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04783 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Name: Beryl Hewitt

Representor No: PRS02506

Representation ID: REP04785 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04785 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2155

Housing

Ardsley Common (south of)

Name: D A Clegg

Representor No: PRS02507

Representation ID: REP04788 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04788 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Name: Pauline Wood

Representor No: PRS02508

Representation ID: REP04790 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04790 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Name: Joyce Thompson

Representor No: PRS02510

Representation ID: REP04792 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04792 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2155

Housing

Ardsley Common (south of)

Name: Patricia Aston

Representor No: PRS02513

Representation ID: REP04796 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04796 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Name: L. G Wilson

Representor No: PRS02515

Representation ID: REP04799 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04799 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Name: S Laurence

Representor No: PRS02517

Representation ID: REP04801 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04801 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2155

Housing

Ardsley Common (south of)

Name: C Graham

Representor No: PRS02518

Representation ID: REP04803 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04803 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Name: M Allsop

Representor No: PRS02520

Representation ID: REP04805 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04805 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Name: R Hartill

Representor No: PRS02521

Representation ID: REP04806 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04806 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2155

Housing

Ardsley Common (south of)

Name: Edith Holmes

Representor No: PRS02522

Representation ID: REP04808 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04808 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Name: Harry Holmes

Representor No: PRS02524

Representation ID: REP04811 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04811 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Name: Ann Morse

Representor No: PRS02526

Representation ID: REP04813 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04813 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2155

Housing

Ardsley Common (south of)

Name: L.r Morse

Representor No: PRS02527

Representation ID: REP04816 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04816 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Name: Michael Hartill

Representor No: PRS02556

Representation ID: REP04847 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04847 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Name: Jim Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02561

Representation ID: REP04852 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04852 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2155

Housing

Ardsley Common (south of)

Name: Helen Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02562

Representation ID: REP04855 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04855 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Name: Ronald Gill

Representor No: PRS02564

Representation ID: REP04858 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04858 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Name: A.w Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02565

Representation ID: REP04859 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04859 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2155

Housing

Ardsley Common (south of)

Name: J Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02566

Representation ID: REP04860 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04860 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Name: Norman Dearden

Representor No: PRS02568

Representation ID: REP04857 Question Ref: H4

2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Representation ID: REP04857 Question Ref: H4

1274 North of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 326, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Comments as above but numbers rise to 1850 households...[2155 South of Ardsley common, Site Capacity 246, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
A green bolt site which, taken with adjacent potential developments would lead to large areas being developed, giving rise to over 1500 households. The local infrastructure cannot withstand this amount of development. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.] Taken in conjunction with site ref 2127 Tingley Station numbers rise to 2980, more than are required in the whole of Aireborough or outer North West or outer South. This site should be removed from consideration for housing development.

Name: Margaret Powell

Representor No: PRS02712

Representation ID: REP05168 Question Ref: H4

All roads lead to the A650. This is a very busy road with traffic queing at peak times. My concerns are for the extra amount of traffic generated by building approx 600 more houses in the area. I would like the air quality, noise levels and pollution caused by excessive traffic to be considered. Also schools, doctors etc in the local area are full so further extensions to these areas will be required

Name: Trevor Sherborne

Representor No: PRS02724

Representation ID: REP05437 Question Ref: H4

2155, 1274, 1143F. Again no schools, long waiting times at doctors. Has anyone from Highways been out to see the problems with the roads near these sites. Common Lane has vehicles, in some places, parked on both sides of the road. I have to come out onto common Lane from The Grove and now it is hazardous without introducing the large amount of traffic these sites will generate. Again we will be loosing Greenfield sites and increasing pollution into the area with traffic pollution. We have enough pollution in the area from the M1, M62, and A650. Also what about the loss of wildlife in the area

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2155

Housing

Ardasley Common (south of)

Name: Richard Marshall

Representor No: PRS03170

Representation ID: REP01024 Question Ref: H4

2098C, 2105, 2155, 3000, 3056,3064, 3078A, 4004, and 4029. As previously stated the amber sites that are greenbelt land should not be considered for development.

Representation ID: REP01024 Question Ref: H5

1079, 1072, 1077, 1143B, 1143D, 1171B, 1200A, 1258, 1284a, 1285, 1344, 2098a, 3365, 3456A.2098C, 2105, 2155, 3000, 3056,3064, 3078A, 4004, and 4029. As previously stated the amber sites that are greenbelt land should not be considered for development. Site 1032 is designated as a protected area of search this land has been retained along the edge of the existing settlement pending more suitable sites being found in the longer term this site should only be developed as a last resort.

Representation ID: REP01024 Question Ref: H2

1079, 1072, 1077, 1143B, 1143D, 1171B, 1200A, 1258, 1284a, 1285, 1344, 2098a, 3365, 3456A. All these sites are green belt sites , green belt land is there to stop urban sprawl and the destruction of the countryside that still remains in this area. If sites 1143B, 1143D, 1143F,2155, 1274, 1032, and 2128 are built on East Ardsley West Ardsley and Tingley will just become one built up area hemmed in by the M62. Not all of these are greenbelt sites but if the development is allowed the basic principal of having greenbelt in this area will be completely wrecked!

Name: David Florence

Representor No: PRS03515

Representation ID: REP01088 Question Ref: H3

2155 - highre ground, nearer to current roads

Name: Lisa Jackson

Representor No: PRS04076

Representation ID: REP01267 Question Ref: H5

Site ref 1274Reason - The current infrastructure in East Ardsley already cannot cope with the current population. The school is already full, with siblings of existing pupils already unable to gain a place at the same school. Local doctors surgeries no longer accept new patients from East Ardsley. The A650 Bradford Road already struggles to cope with the volume of traffic, with regular lengthy queues at various traffic lights in and around East Ardsley, which are particularly bad during morning and afternoon rush hours. Traffic actually grinds to a halt on the A650 when there are problems on the nearby motorway networks causing traffic to divert to avoid motorway delays. Further development would mean that there is strong likelihood that the current infrastructure would collapse under the pressure of an increase in population and traffic. Site ref - 2155Reason - The current infrastructure in East Ardsley already cannot cope with the current population. The school is already full, with siblings of existing pupils already unable to gain a place at the same school. Local doctors surgeries no longer accept new patients from East Ardsley. The A650 Bradford Road already struggles to cope with the volume of traffic, with regular lengthy queues at various traffic lights in and around East Ardsley, which are particularly bad during morning and afternoon rush hours. Traffic actually grinds to a halt on the A650 when there are problems on the nearby motorway networks causing traffic to divert to avoid motorway delays. Further development would mean that there is strong likelihood that the current infrastructure would collapse under the pressure of an increase in population and trafficSite ref - 2105Reason - The current infrastructure in East Ardsley already cannot cope with the current population. The school is already full, with siblings of existing pupils already unable to gain a place at the same school. Local doctors surgeries no longer accept new patients from East Ardsley. The A650 Bradford Road already struggles to cope with the volume of traffic, with regular lengthy queues at various traffic lights in and around East Ardsley, which are particularly bad during morning and afternoon rush hours. Traffic actually grinds to a halt on the A650 when there are problems on the nearby motorway networks causing traffic to divert to avoid motorway delays. Further development would mean that there is strong likelihood that the current infrastructure would collapse under the pressure of an increase in population and traffic

Name: Pamela Caveen

Representor No: PRS04212

Representation ID: REP00768 Question Ref: H4

2155, 1274, 1067B,1069, 1143F. I would give the same reasons for these sites not being used for housing as I gave in my answer about the 'green' sites, with the additional comment that access to these sites seems to be more difficult anyway, particularly for sites 1067B and 1069.

Name: Paul Whittleston

Representor No: PRS04278

Representation ID: REP01470 Question Ref: H4

Site ref - 1274, 2155 and 1143FSame reason as previous.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2155

Housing

Ardsley Common (south of)

Name: Andrea Jarvis

Representor No: PRS04757

Representation ID: REP01155 Question Ref: H4

2155 - lack of access and overload of infrastructure would cause excessive issues with Doctors, Schools, Dentists - the roads are gridlocked in that area already and although on paper access might look good to motorway links the roads are already at breaking point as are residents with the lack of investment in infrastructure before further development - already the village has been overdeveloped down the Falls without an increase in local amenities for people including school places, doctors etc.

Representation ID: REP01155 Question Ref: H5

2155 - lack of access and overload of infrastructure would cause excessive issues with Doctors, Schools, Dentists - the roads are gridlocked in that area already and although on paper access might look good to motorway links the roads are already at breaking point as are residents with the lack of investment in infrastructure before further development - already the village has been overdeveloped down the Falls without an increase in local amenities for people including school places, doctors etc.

Name: D Hutchinson

Representor No: PRS05106

Representation ID: REP05686 Question Ref: H4

I would like to log my objection to the planned housing developments 1032 and 2125/2155. I live on New lane, not the one shown on the map as New lane right through from Bradford Road which is in fact a dirt road that was used for transporting coal from the old pit to the mill, but the one that is a dead end up to the fields concerned. We have had many developments in our area and this has caused many problems for the residents ie. schools are too small, it took me nearly five weeks to see my doctor which are stretched to their limit even though they, like the schools have expanded. As a village we had 2 butchers, 4 shops, newsagents, 2 chemists, dentist, doctors and 2 post offices. We now have 1 shop plus a Tesco at the petrol station, 1 post office, no chemist, no doctors, no dentist (unless you go private) and things surely cannot go on. There is no mention of any of these amenities being provided unless I have missed it, it's just houses, houses and more houses. After you approved the Appletree Court at the back of my house our garden flooded and still does in bad weather, also killing all my fruit trees as the soil was so wet. The New lane (that isn't) development suffers these problems even to the point of there being ducks swimming so not exactly good building land. Please give us a break and let the amenities we have the time to catch up or provide them.

Name: Lisa Mulherin

Representor No: PRS05734

Representation ID: REP07126 Question Ref: H4

1274 and 2155 Land off Ardsley Common – each of these sites would be unacceptable. They are too large and individually they would result in an unsustainable development due to lack of school places, doctors surgeries, dentists and inadequate public transport. Collectively they are completely unacceptable and should be made Red.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2155

Housing

Ardsley Common (south of)

Name: Neil Dawson

Representor No: PRS05884

Representation ID: REP06563 Question Ref: H4

Suggested sites from Amber to Red;

309
1067B
1069
1143F
1220A
1274
1275A
1279
1332
2105
2155
3000
3064
3078A
4004

These sites are almost all located within the existing Green Belt and expansion into the Green Belt would lead to increased urban sprawl between the various townships in the Outer South West, and lead to coalescence between communities

Development of the Green Belt sites would also reduce the open green area and provide encroachment into the countryside around Morley and other smaller townships.

In addition there is insufficient road capacity and little scope for expansion for other necessary services. There would be a requirement for new or upgrading of existing roads which would therefore favour development on sites that are already located within the Morley or the Leeds Urban areas rather than eroding the Green Belt further.

Site 3078A is close to potential development in Kirklees and could lead to the complete erosion of the Green Belt and open green space between Leeds and Kirklees.

Any further development at sites 1275A and 1279 would reduce the Green Belt between the existing residential boundary and the A653 Dewsbury Road to a narrow strip which would put pressure in future years to extend residential use further east.

See rep for full details.

Name: Karen Renshaw

Representor No: PRS06048

Representation ID: REP06876 Question Ref: H4

2155 – South of Ardsley Common. This is valued green belt land and needs to be retained in that way. Ardsley has had many new developments within the last 5 years. Development on this site would take character from the village and its boundary territorial community element.

Many of the reasons for opposing all these sites identified are based on the lack of infrastructure, schools & education, transport, safety, health & well-being, Gp's surgeries, poor links with public transport, noise, pollution and busy highways created by the increased volume of traffic. Please take all these serious matters into account and I would appreciate a briefing before any further decisions are made.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2155

Housing

Ardsley Common (south of)

Name: C Hutchinson

Representor No: PRS06307

Representation ID: REP07234 Question Ref: H4

I would like to log my objection to the planned housing developments 1032 and 2125/2155. I live on New lane, not the one shown on the map as New lane right through from Bradford Road which is in fact a dirt road that was used for transporting coal from the old pit to the mill, but the one that is a dead end up to the fields concerned. We have had many developments in our area and this has caused many problems for the residents ie. schools are too small, it took me nearly five weeks to see my doctor which are stretched to their limit even though they like the schools have expanded. As a village we had 2 butchers, 4 shops, newsagents, 2 chemists, dentist, doctors and 2 post offices. We now have 1 shop plus a Tesco at the petrol station, 1 post office, no chemist, no doctors, no dentist (unless you go private) and things surely cannot go on. There is no mention of any of these amenities being provided unless I have missed it, it's just houses, houses and more houses. After you approved the Appletree Court at the back of my house our garden flooded and still does in bad weather, also killing all my fruit trees as the soil was so wet. The New lane (that isn't) development suffers these problems even to the point of there being ducks swimming so not exactly good building land. Please give us a break and let the amenities we have the time to catch up or provide them.

Name: Hanover Developments (Wakefield)

Representor No: PRS06426

Representation ID: REP07480 Question Ref: H4

Leeds Site Allocations Plan- Issues and Options
Land to the south of Common Lane, Tingley

We act on behalf of Hanover Developments (Wakefield) Ltd who have an interest in land to the south of Common Lane, Tingley. The site has been assessed as part of the first stage of work completed by the Council on the Sites Allocation Plan and is known as 2155 and 1274.

Our clients have previously instructed a number of consultants to submit reports assessing the suitability of the site to be brought forward for residential development. These include the following:

- Environmental Report (Wardell Armstrong) submitted 12th October 2012
- Ecology Report (Wardell Armstrong) submitted 12th October 2012
- Site Development Document (JRP Associates) submitted 21st March 2013

Hanover Developments (Wakefield) Ltd have also instructed the following consultants to produce reports assessing the suitability of the site to be brought forward for residential development as follows and enclosed:

- Transport Assessment (Optima) dated April 2013
- Bat Survey (Wardell Armstrong) June 2013

The reports have been carried out as if sites 2155 and 1274 are one comprehensive site and this is how the Council should be assessing them.

It is noted in the site specific assessment (within Volume 2— 10 Outer South West) that the site has been suggested as a site which "has potential but there may be issues which need to be resolved or the site may not be in such a location as those highlighted in green". Specifically, highways concerns about accessibility and access provision are raised. As you will now see, Hanover Developments (Wakefield) Ltd have commissioned a Transport Assessment which concludes that there are no reasons or transport grounds why the development of the site should not be included within the Site Allocations Plan for residential purposes.

Through the body of work provided in support of the residential allocation of the site, it is requested that the scoring of the site is upgraded to 'green' and allocated as a residential site.

The work undertaken by Wardell Armstrong has also highlighted the potential of the site to deliver a heat recovery system from the existing mine water. Wardell Armstrong have experience in projects of this nature and have advised Hanover Developments (Wakefield) Ltd that this is something that is a very distinct and practical possibility at this site. Clearly if the site is selected as a housing site, this would be a clear benefit that would also meet with the sustainability credentials of the plan and meet the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework.

We consider that the work provided to date gives a clear indication that there are no constraints to development and that the site should be allocated a housing site.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2155

Housing

Ardsley Common (south of)

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H4

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Amber Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are be minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H4

Site 2155 - Together with 2128 and others, would be part of an incoherent sprawl linking Tingley and East Ardsley. Amber to red.

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H4

Disagree with Council's amber assessment, think the site should be red

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H4

Site 2155 - Together with 2128 and others, would be part of an incoherent sprawl linking Tingley and East Ardsley. Amber to red.

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H4

Disagree with Council's amber assessment, think the site should be red

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2159

Housing

Whitehall Road, Craven Park, Farnley

Name: Hazel Murgatroyd

Representor No: PRS02880

Representation ID: REP05439 Question Ref: H7

The traffic on Whitehall Road is already horrendous, with many not keeping the speed limit. More houses mean more traffic and already we take our life into our hands trying to cross the road. There is a blind corner further on the road and more traffic would be a nightmare

Name: Jonathan Barrow

Representor No: PRS06088

Representation ID: REP06943 Question Ref: H7

1171A
2159

This is green belt and this development would spoil our views. Whitehall Road is already congested and the infrastructure of New Farnley and the surrounding area cannot cope with any additional houses.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network. From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2164

Housing

Broad Oaks Farm, Churwell

Name: Jean Douglas

Representor No: PRS02400

Representation ID: REP04654 Question Ref: H7

Since moving to Churwell 46 years ago, the various builds – especially the extensive westwood and new village developments – have overwhelmed our single main road village.

-Utilities have constantly been under pressure, as has Churwell School and just one Doctor's surgery.

-The A643, Elland Road is our village's sole access to and from Leeds. Crawling tail backs are a regular feature, even more so since "The New Village Project was Allowed.

-Further proposed housing for Churwell in excess of 1,400 dwellings will be absolutely disastrous as far as roads, transport, education, health and welfare services are concerned. All of these are already stretched in Churwell.

-Green Belt Land is involved which is against government guidelines and policy.

I. Object particularly to the three larger proposed developments

(a) Land at Hepworth Avenue (261) and Hepworth 2#(80) = 341 Dwellings

(b) Land at South of Wood View= 471 Dwellings

(c) Land at Broad Oaks Farm = 251 Dwellings

(i) All the dwellings of (a) and (b) and (c) will except use of Elland Road (A643) to go to Morley and beyond or to the Leeds Ring Road and beyond. The road will not cope provide a satisfactory transport route expected and required by motorists in order to get to work and go about their businesses timeously.

(ii) Utilities – stretched at present – would face perilous pressure.

(iii) Insufficient dental facilities already.

(iv) Insufficient medical facilities already.

(v) No Multi- facility health centre at all.

(vi) Churwell School will not cope with such potential child increases.

(vi) Churwell School will not cope with such potential child increases.

The current shortages in items (iii) to (vi) cause unwelcome pressures on our Morley neighbouring Town's School, Doctor's, Health Clinic Services, Dentists and Welfare facilities. These services may be savagely curtailed if other proposals in the Outer South West Area cause Morley's spare capacities for Churwell to start sinking with additional loads and pressures.

I Object to any potential planning agreements in the above Developments (a)and(b)and(c) Which involves Green belt land instead of priority brownfield sites aimed to help resolve the House shortage problems.

It seems futile to waste expense on further applications from Developers when reports show and apparent 20,000 properties which have already been granted planning permission across Leeds and mainly on Brownfield sites – but which Developers appear to have decided not to Develop, speedy completion of 20,000 would certainly help the shortages. It should be especially on Green belt, may be considered. Local Authorities are aware that Developments on Greenfield sites can only happen in exceptional circumstances this has been pointed out by the Planning Minister, Nick Boles, he has plainly indicated that Local Authorities will need exceptional circumstances and will need to undertake extensive consultations with rate-paying communities, (not interloping Developer's) if any support is to be gained for any proposed local changes or compromises concerning Green Belt Land.

I Object to any potential overloading of our Infrastructure.

I will expect the Local Planning Department, which is employed to work on my behalf to insist that the Development framework must have a guaranteed current and guaranteed proposed forward plan to deal with our existing breaking infrastructure. Crisis management and urgent consultations hoping that "solutions will turn up" must be minimalised, if not extinguished, before considering any future proposals which would exacerbate current problems and allow any area services to further struggle or fail.

I trust you will take these few objectional points on board when going through to the next phase of proceedings.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2164

Housing

Broad Oaks Farm, Churwell

Name: Persimmon Homes

Representor No: PRS05691

Representation ID: REP06894 Question Ref: H7

Sites 1220B and 2164

Persimmon Homes does not agree with the red assessment of the sites.

The basis of the Council's red rating is the sites location within the Green Belt and concerns about its isolation and access requirements. In reality, this site will come forward as a comprehensive masterplan with Sites 1282, 1283, 3068 and 1220A and will be a later phase once the requisite access infrastructure has been put in place.

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.

The sprawl of Morley will be maintained by the railway line to the east. This is a defensible boundary and will, therefore, maintain separation between Morley and Middleton.

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another.

The merging of Morley and Middleton will be prevented by the railway line to the east. This is a defensible boundary and will, therefore, maintain separation between Morley and Middleton.

Safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Encroachment into the countryside will be restricted by the railway line.

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Land south of Wood View and Broad Oak Farm do not contribute to the setting and special character of a historic town.

Assist urban regeneration

Releasing this site from the Green Belt for housing will contribute to a demonstrable need for housing in Morley that cannot be met by existing sites outside the Green Belt.

We recommend the Council:

- Clarifies how it has assessed the distance to the rail station and nearest bus stop.
- States that the site is available, suitable and achievable.
- Updates the assessment to remove references to Listed Buildings (there are no Listed Buildings in the vicinity of the site).
- States that the development of this site conforms with the Core Strategy and is major settlement extension, along with Site 1282, 1283, 3068 and 1220A.
- Provide further information on what has been used to rank the site.
- Clarifies the Green Belt status of the sites (assessment indicates that Sites 1220B and 2164 are not wholly within the Green Belt).

See rep for full details.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2164

Housing

Broad Oaks Farm, Churwell

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3000

Housing

Land at Bradford Road Gildersome

Name: Brian Guy

Representor No: PRS00142

Representation ID: REP04659 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Wenda P Whitehead

Representor No: PRS00312

Representation ID: REP04786 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Janice Beever

Representor No: PRS00441

Representation ID: REP04791 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: P S Barrie

Representor No: PRS00915

Representation ID: REP04810 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Representation ID: REP04769 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Representation ID: REP04781 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Lynne Paul

Representor No: PRS01169

Representation ID: REP04800 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3000

Housing

Land at Bradford Road Gildersome

Name: D Paul

Representor No: PRS01183

Representation ID: REP04793 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: B Stringer

Representor No: PRS01606

Representation ID: REP04797 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: L.e Beever

Representor No: PRS01607

Representation ID: REP04804 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: J Cowie

Representor No: PRS02227

Representation ID: REP04768 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Susan Holt

Representor No: PRS02289

Representation ID: REP04772 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Dereck Holt

Representor No: PRS02311

Representation ID: REP04766 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3000

Housing

Land at Bradford Road Gildersome

Name: Jenni Davenport

Representor No: PRS02330

Representation ID: REP04770 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Frank Raven

Representor No: PRS02339

Representation ID: REP04771 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: E Naylor

Representor No: PRS02363

Representation ID: REP04780 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Kathleen Paver

Representor No: PRS02372

Representation ID: REP04774 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: C Guy

Representor No: PRS02377

Representation ID: REP04767 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: C Clegg

Representor No: PRS02406

Representation ID: REP04663 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3000

Housing

Land at Bradford Road Gildersome

Name: Doreen Gill

Representor No: PRS02496

Representation ID: REP04755 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: D Naylor

Representor No: PRS02497

Representation ID: REP04773 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: A Paver

Representor No: PRS02498

Representation ID: REP04775 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: James Bowers

Representor No: PRS02500

Representation ID: REP04777 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Alan Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02501

Representation ID: REP04778 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Vivienne Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02502

Representation ID: REP04779 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3000

Housing

Land at Bradford Road Gildersome

Name: Vivian Oxtoby

Representor No: PRS02504

Representation ID: REP04783 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Beryl Hewitt

Representor No: PRS02506

Representation ID: REP04785 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: D A Clegg

Representor No: PRS02507

Representation ID: REP04788 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Pauline Wood

Representor No: PRS02508

Representation ID: REP04790 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Joyce Thompson

Representor No: PRS02510

Representation ID: REP04792 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Patricia Aston

Representor No: PRS02513

Representation ID: REP04796 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3000

Housing

Land at Bradford Road Gildersome

Name: L. G Wilson

Representor No: PRS02515

Representation ID: REP04799 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: S Laurence

Representor No: PRS02517

Representation ID: REP04801 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: C Graham

Representor No: PRS02518

Representation ID: REP04803 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: M Allsop

Representor No: PRS02520

Representation ID: REP04805 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: R Hartill

Representor No: PRS02521

Representation ID: REP04806 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Edith Holmes

Representor No: PRS02522

Representation ID: REP04808 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3000

Housing

Land at Bradford Road Gildersome

Name: Harry Holmes

Representor No: PRS02524

Representation ID: REP04811 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Ann Morse

Representor No: PRS02526

Representation ID: REP04813 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: L.r Morse

Representor No: PRS02527

Representation ID: REP04816 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Michael Hartill

Representor No: PRS02556

Representation ID: REP04847 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Jim Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02561

Representation ID: REP04852 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Helen Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02562

Representation ID: REP04855 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3000

Housing

Land at Bradford Road Gildersome

Name: Ronald Gill

Representor No: PRS02564

Representation ID: REP04858 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: A.w Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02565

Representation ID: REP04859 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: J Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02566

Representation ID: REP04860 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Norman Dearden

Representor No: PRS02568

Representation ID: REP04857 Question Ref: H4

3000 Street Lane Gildersome, Site Capacity 32, Ward Morley North
Green belt site being considered as part of larger development ref 3064....
3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Richard Marshall

Representor No: PRS03170

Representation ID: REP01024 Question Ref: H4

2098C, 2105, 2155, 3000, 3056,3064, 3078A, 4004, and 4029. As previously stated the amber sites that are greenbelt land should not be considered for development.

Representation ID: REP01024 Question Ref: H5

1079, 1072, 1077, 1143B, 1143D, 1171B, 1200A, 1258, 1284a, 1285, 1344, 2098a, 3365, 3456A.2098C, 2105, 2155, 3000, 3056,3064, 3078A, 4004, and 4029. As previously stated the amber sites that are greenbelt land should not be considered for development. Site 1032 is designated as a protected area of search this land has been retained along the edge of the existing settlement pending more suitable sites being found in the longer term this site should only be developed as a last resort.

Name: Paul Crowther

Representor No: PRS05072

Representation ID: REP05633 Question Ref: H4

3064 & 3000 provide an infill area which can be developed with little impact on the green belt. We own two sections of land within 3064 and there is a large area of frontage onto Bradford Road which will allow access into sites 3064 & 3000. I believe these should be removed from the greenbelt and allocated residential status.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3000

Housing

Land at Bradford Road Gildersome

Name: John Hall

Representor No: PRS05163

Representation ID: REP07384 Question Ref: H4

Site 3000 and Site 3064 Gildersome (see separate appendices in saved pdfs)

1.Introduction

1.1.These reports have been produced in response to Leeds City Councils consultation with regard to the Leeds site allocations plan and in particular to the housing site 3000, Land to the rear of 1-24 Street Lane, Gildersome.

1.2.The reasoning behind this representation is two fold. Firstly, to suggest the creation of a new allocation revising the boundaries suggested by the allocations document to a more logical housing site (see fig 4 in the appendix) and secondly to confirm the ability of both the new site and the original site 3000 to address issues of highways access to the site which is identified within the site allocations document as the reason behind why site 3000 is colour coded amber and not green.

2.Site and Surroundings

2.1 The potential development site is located on land to the rear of 1-24A Street Lane, Gildersome, approximately 800m south of the village centre, and 900m east of the neighbouring village of Drighlington. The site is also located 2.4km west of Morley Town Centre, and 7.5km southwest of Leeds City Centre. The site has been identified as an 'Amber' site by Leeds City Council and is located within the Outer South West Area that encompasses Morley, East and West Ardsley, Beeston, Belle Isle, Drighlington, Gildersome, and Middleton. The majority of the site is made up of Site Ref 3000, and part of the neighbouring site (Site Ref 3064).

2.2 The site is largely a greenfield site used for agricultural purposes. However, to the south side there are 3 industrial starter units, that can be reached using the existing access off Bradford Road. The site access is also used to reach the adjacent electricity substation. The site including the access totals some 2.31 Hectares, using the whole 1.2 Hectares of Site Ref 3000, and 1.11 of Site Ref 3064. The site is bounded by Gildersome Sports and Cricket Club to the north, the remaining section of Site Ref 3064 and a plant hire depot to the west, the residential properties of 1 to 24A Street Lane to the east, and the residential properties off Bradford Road and the electricity substation to the south.

3.The creation of a new site allocation.

3.1 The two site allocations (site 3000 and 3064) have been reviewed to see if a more logical site can be formed that would sit more comfortably within all the planning considerations that form the decision making process within this site allocation process. The resulting revised site can be seen on the accompanying plan (Drawing No: 13054/03). This plan shows an indicative layout that shows how the site could work for illustrative purposes only. Additionally, part of the site to the front which is understood formed part of the SHLAA site 3004 is included to possibly assist with the site access, should this be deemed necessary.

3.2. The creation of this site means that it is within the ownership of two individuals and is readily available should it be allocated as an housing site.

3.3. The revised site is located within the Green Belt and as such, this revised site is now suggested as it provides the best possible site available when assessed against the Green Belt methodology.

3.4 The revised site has physical boundaries to all sides. To the North of the site is a protected playing pitch in the form of Gildersome Sports and Cricket club. This club forms the whole of the Northern boundary and this would prevent further sprawl in a Northward direction (see fig 1 and 2 appendix). The Eastern boundary is formed by housing, again along its entire length (see fig 3 appendix). This also forms the Green Belt boundary as does the Southern boundary, which has an electrical substation and a house with Bradford Road beyond. Finally, the Western boundary is formed by a commercial premises, along two thirds its length, consisting of large buildings and open working areas (see fig 4 appendix). This site also forms the remaining part of site allocation 3064 and if this were to be confirmed as a housing allocation, the revised site proposed here would be totally enclosed by physical development. As it is now, only the Northern part of the Western boundary would form a connection with the more open aspect of the Green Belt beyond and the site would be almost totally enclosed within physical barriers that would prevent further encroachment into the Green Belt.

3.5. As a result, it is considered that in terms of locating housing development within the Green Belt, this revised site would form one of the most acceptable sites within the whole site allocations document due to its enclosed nature and strong physical barriers.

4.Highway access.

4.1 The main issue raised within the site allocations document against site 3000 and 3064 was one of highways and in particular access to the site. This has been dealt with through the accompanying highways report. This demonstrates that access to both site 3000 or the proposed revised site can successfully be achieved to overcome these concerns and that this should not inhibit the site from being included as a Green coded housing allocation.

5.Summary.

5.1 The site is located within the Green Belt as are a large number of the sites proposed within the site allocations document. It appears to be generally accepted that to achieve the numbers of houses that the targets require, it will be inevitable that sites will be required that are located within the Green Belt. It is therefore necessary to find the best sites that have the least impact on the aims of the Green Belt and as described above, the site is considered to be as good as could be found, given its enclosed siting with strong physical boundaries that would prevent further sprawl into the Green Belt.

5.2. Confirmation of the acceptability of the site in highways terms with a good vehicular access as well as excellent multiple pedestrian links suggest that the site is ideally suited to housing development and that its sustainable nature shown within the highways report is further confirmed by the recent approval of a 26 house development (subject to the signing of a section 106 agreement) approximately 200 metres away on the Southern side of Bradford Road.

5.3 As a result, it is considered that the site currently considered as amber in the colour coding system of the site allocations document, should be coded green as it provides a sustainable, accessible site that fulfils best the Green Belt criteria for such sites. It is readily available and whilst obviously within the Green Belt, and therefore not as desirable as brownfield sites in terms of order of delivery, it should still be given a short term delivery phasing due to its availability and its standing as one of the very best Green Belt sites available.

5.4. It is therefore requested that this new site boundary be considered as the preferential manner of dealing with this housing allocation site bringing the most overall benefits and that the site be colour coded green and allocated a short term delivery phasing.

5.5 If this new site is not considered acceptable, then site 3000, using SHLAA site 3004 for access purposes, be considered suitable for housing allocation and that this be colour coded green and allocated a short term delivery phasing

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3000

Housing

Land at Bradford Road Gildersome

Name: John Hall

Representor No: PRS05163

Representation ID: REP05742 Question Ref: H4

Site Allocations representation for sites 3000 and 3064 of the Outer South West area

Site Allocations representation for sites 3000 and 3064 of the Outer South West area

1.Introduction

1.1.These reports have been produced in response to Leeds City Councils consultation with regard to the Leeds site allocations plan and in particular to the housing site 3000, Land to the rear of 1-24 Street Lane, Gildersome.

1.2.The reasoning behind this representation is two fold. Firstly, to suggest the creation of a new allocation revising the boundaries suggested by the allocations document to a more logical housing site (see fig 4 in the appendix) and secondly to confirm the ability of both the new site and the original site 3000 to address issues of highways access to the site which is identified within the site allocations document as the reason behind why site 3000 is colour coded amber and not green.

2.Site and Surroundings

2.1 The potential development site is located on land to the rear of 1-24A Street Lane, Gildersome, approximately 800m south of the village centre, and 900m east of the neighbouring village of Drighlington. The site is also located 2.4km west of Morley Town Centre, and 7.5km southwest of Leeds City Centre. The site has been identified as an 'Amber' site by Leeds City Council and is located within the Outer South West Area that encompasses Morley, East and West Ardsley, Beeston, Belle Isle, Drighlington, Gildersome, and Middleton. The majority of the site is made up of Site Ref 3000, and part of the neighbouring site (Site Ref 3064).

2.2 The site is largely a greenfield site used for agricultural purposes. However, to the south side there are 3 industrial starter units, that can be reached using the existing access off Bradford Road. The site access is also used to reach the adjacent electricity substation. The site including the access totals some 2.31 Hectares, using the whole 1.2 Hectares of Site Ref 3000, and 1.11 of Site Ref 3064. The site is bounded by Gildersome Sports and Cricket Club to the north, the remaining section of Site Ref 3064 and a plant hire depot to the west, the residential properties of 1 to 24A Street Lane to the east, and the residential properties off Bradford Road and the electricity substation to the south.

3.The creation of a new site allocation.

3.1 The two site allocations (site 3000 and 3064) have been reviewed to see if a more logical site can be formed that would sit more comfortably within all the planning considerations that form the decision making process within this site allocation process. The resulting revised site can be seen on the accompanying plan (Drawing No: 13054/03). This plan shows an indicative layout that shows how the site could work for illustrative purposes only. Additionally, part of the site to the front which is understood formed part of the SHLAA site 3004 is included to possibly assist with the site access, should this be deemed necessary.

3.2. The creation of this site means that it is within the ownership of two individuals and is readily available should it be allocated as an housing site.

3.3. The revised site is located within the Green Belt and as such, this revised site is now suggested as it provides the best possible site available when assessed against the Green Belt methodology.

3.4 The revised site has physical boundaries to all sides. To the North of the site is a protected playing pitch in the form of Gildersome Sports and Cricket club. This club forms the whole of the Northern boundary and this would prevent further sprawl in a Northward direction (see fig 1 and 2 appendix). The Eastern boundary is formed by housing, again along its entire length (see fig 3 appendix). This also forms the Green Belt boundary as does the Southern boundary, which has an electrical substation and a house with Bradford Road beyond. Finally, the Western boundary is formed by a commercial premises, along two thirds its length, consisting of large buildings and open working areas (see fig 4 appendix). This site also forms the remaining part of site allocation 3064 and if this were to be confirmed as a housing allocation, the revised site proposed here would be totally enclosed by physical development. As it is now, only the Northern part of the Western boundary would form a connection with the more open aspect of the Green Belt beyond and the site would be almost totally enclosed within physical barriers that would prevent further encroachment into the Green Belt.

3.5. As a result, it is considered that in terms of locating housing development within the Green Belt, this revised site would form one of the most acceptable sites within the whole site allocations document due to its enclosed nature and strong physical barriers.

4.Highway access.

4.1 The main issue raised within the site allocations document against site 3000 and 3064 was one of highways and in particular access to the site. This has been dealt with through the accompanying highways report. This demonstrates that access to both site 3000 or the proposed revised site can successfully be achieved to overcome these concerns and that this should not inhibit the site form being included as a Green coded housing allocation.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3000

Housing

Land at Bradford Road Gildersome

Name: John Hall

Representor No: PRS05163

5.Summary.

5.1 The site is located within the Green Belt as are a large number of the sites proposed within the site allocations document. It appears to be generally accepted that to achieve the numbers of houses that the targets require, it will be inevitable that sites will be required that are located within the Green Belt. It is therefore necessary to find the best sites that have the least impact on the aims of the Green Belt and as described above, the site is considered to be as good as could be found, given its enclosed siting with strong physical boundaries that would prevent further sprawl into the Green Belt.

5.2. Confirmation of the acceptability of the site in highways terms with a good vehicular access as well as excellent multiple pedestrian links suggest that the site is ideally suited to housing development and that its sustainable nature shown within the highways report is further confirmed by the recent approval of a 26 house development (subject to the signing of a section 106 agreement) approximately 200 metres away on the Southern side of Bradford Road.

5.3 As a result, it is considered that the site currently considered as amber in the colour coding system of the site allocations document, should be coded green as it provides a sustainable, accessible site that fulfils best the Green Belt criteria for such sites. It is readily available and whilst obviously within the Green Belt, and therefore not as desirable as brownfield sites in terms of order of delivery, it should still be given a short term delivery phasing due to its availability and its standing as one of the very best Green Belt sites available.

5.4. It is therefore requested that this new site boundary be considered as the preferential manner of dealing with this housing allocation site bringing the most overall benefits and that the site be colour coded green and allocated a short term delivery phasing.

5.5 If this new site is not considered acceptable, then site 3000, using SHLAA site 3004 for access purposes, be considered suitable for housing allocation and that this be colour coded green and allocated a short term delivery phasing

1.Introduction

1.1.These reports have been produced in response to Leeds City Councils consultation with regard to the Leeds site allocations plan and in particular to the housing site 3000, Land to the rear of 1-24 Street Lane, Gildersome.

1.2.The reasoning behind this representation is two fold. Firstly, to suggest the creation of a new allocation revising the boundaries suggested by the allocations document to a more logical housing site (see fig 4 in the appendix) and secondly to confirm the ability of both the new site and the original site 3000 to address issues of highways access to the site which is identified within the site allocations document as the reason behind why site 3000 is colour coded amber and not green.

2.Site and Surroundings

2.1 The potential development site is located on land to the rear of 1-24A Street Lane, Gildersome, approximately 800m south of the village centre, and 900m east of the neighbouring village of Drighlington. The site is also located 2.4km west of Morley Town Centre, and 7.5km southwest of Leeds City Centre. The site has been identified as an 'Amber' site by Leeds City Council and is located within the Outer South West Area that encompasses Morley, East and West Ardsley, Beeston, Belle Isle, Drighlington, Gildersome, and Middleton. The majority of the site is made up of Site Ref 3000, and part of the neighbouring site (Site Ref 3064).

2.2 The site is largely a greenfield site used for agricultural purposes. However, to the south side there are 3 industrial starter units, that can be reached using the existing access off Bradford Road. The site access is also used to reach the adjacent electricity substation. The site including the access totals some 2.31 Hectares, using the whole 1.2 Hectares of Site Ref 3000, and 1.11 of Site Ref 3064. The site is bounded by Gildersome Sports and Cricket Club to the north, the remaining section of Site Ref 3064 and a plant hire depot to the west, the residential properties of 1 to 24A Street Lane to the east, and the residential properties off Bradford Road and the electricity substation to the south.

3.The creation of a new site allocation.

3.1 The two site allocations (site 3000 and 3064) have been reviewed to see if a more logical site can be formed that would sit more comfortably within all the planning considerations that form the decision making process within this site allocation process. The resulting revised site can be seen on the accompanying plan (Drawing No: 13054/03). This plan shows an indicative layout that shows how the site could work for illustrative purposes only. Additionally, part of the site to the front which is understood formed part of the SHLAA site 3004 is included to possibly assist with the site access, should this be deemed necessary.

3.2. The creation of this site means that it is within the ownership of two individuals and is readily available should it be allocated as an housing site.

3.3. The revised site is located within the Green Belt and as such, this revised site is now suggested as it provides the best possible site available when assessed against the Green Belt methodology.

3.4 The revised site has physical boundaries to all sides. To the North of the site is a protected playing pitch in the form of Gildersome Sports and Cricket club. This club forms the whole of the Northern boundary and this would prevent further sprawl in a Northward direction (see fig 1 and 2 appendix). The Eastern boundary is formed by housing, again along its entire length (see fig 3 appendix). This also forms the Green Belt boundary as does the Southern boundary, which has an electrical substation and a house with Bradford Road beyond. Finally, the Western boundary is formed by a commercial premises, along two thirds its length, consisting of large buildings and open working areas (see fig 4 appendix). This site also forms the remaining part of site allocation 3064 and if this were to be confirmed as a housing allocation, the revised site proposed here would be totally enclosed by physical development. As it is now, only the Northern part of the Western boundary would form a connection with the more open aspect of the Green Belt beyond and the site would be almost totally enclosed within physical barriers that would prevent further encroachment into the Green Belt.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3000

Housing

Land at Bradford Road Gildersome

Name: John Hall

Representor No: PRS05163

3.5. As a result, it is considered that in terms of locating housing development within the Green Belt, this revised site would form one of the most acceptable sites within the whole site allocations document due to its enclosed nature and strong physical barriers.

4.Highway access.

4.1 The main issue raised within the site allocations document against site 3000 and 3064 was one of highways and in particular access to the site. This has been dealt with through the accompanying highways report. This demonstrates that access to both site 3000 or the proposed revised site can successfully be achieved to overcome these concerns and that this should not inhibit the site from being included as a Green coded housing allocation.

5.Summary.

5.1 The site is located within the Green Belt as are a large number of the sites proposed within the site allocations document. It appears to be generally accepted that to achieve the numbers of houses that the targets require, it will be inevitable that sites will be required that are located within the Green Belt. It is therefore necessary to find the best sites that have the least impact on the aims of the Green Belt and as described above, the site is considered to be as good as could be found, given its enclosed siting with strong physical boundaries that would prevent further sprawl into the Green Belt.

5.2. Confirmation of the acceptability of the site in highways terms with a good vehicular access as well as excellent multiple pedestrian links suggest that the site is ideally suited to housing development and that its sustainable nature shown within the highways report is further confirmed by the recent approval of a 26 house development (subject to the signing of a section 106 agreement) approximately 200 metres away on the Southern side of Bradford Road.

5.3 As a result, it is considered that the site currently considered as amber in the colour coding system of the site allocations document, should be coded green as it provides a sustainable, accessible site that fulfils best the Green Belt criteria for such sites. It is readily available and whilst obviously within the Green Belt, and therefore not as desirable as brownfield sites in terms of order of delivery, it should still be given a short term delivery phasing due to its availability and its standing as one of the very best Green Belt sites available.

5.4. It is therefore requested that this new site boundary be considered as the preferential manner of dealing with this housing allocation site bringing the most overall benefits and that the site be colour coded green and allocated a short term delivery phasing.

5.5 If this new site is not considered acceptable, then site 3000, using SHLAA site 3004 for access purposes, be considered suitable for housing allocation and that this be colour coded green and allocated a short term delivery phasing

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3000

Housing

Land at Bradford Road Gildersome

Name: Jw Crowther & Son Ltd Jw Crowther & Son Ltd

Representor No: PRS05426

Representation ID: REP06017 Question Ref: H4

H5: Which Amber sites do you disagree with and why?

Our client owns land within site ref 3064 which is also adjacent to site ref 3000, which are identified as amber sites in the Issues and Options Draft Site Allocations Plan as a 'site which has potential but issues or not favoured as a green site' and considers that the land should be colour coded green as a site that is developable for housing.

NPPF Tests of soundness

Paragraph 182 states:

The Local Plan will be examined by an independent inspector whose role is to assess whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, legal and procedural requirements, and whether it is sound. A local planning authority should submit a plan for examination which it considers is "sound" – namely that it is:

Positively prepared, Justified, Effective and Consistent with national policy.

Justification

The sites are located to the north of Bradford Road, Gildersome. It is in the south of the village. Drighlington is located a short way to the west. The site is within the outer south-west of Leeds District in a highly sustainable location being close to the aforementioned villages with a decent range of services and amenities (schools, local shopping facilities and restaurants), but is easily accessible to Morley, a town that has a wide range of shops, services and amenities. The site is also just to the north of facilities at Birstall Retail Park which provides a range of shops and restaurants as well as a cinema. The site is well located in terms of the local highway network and is close to Junction 27 of the M62 and the M621.

The land can be accessed via existing access points to the north of Bradford Road, an adopted road which formerly constituted the through road from Morley through Drighlington. The road has been more recently stopped prior to the construction of the new Drighlington bypass and the roundabout/major junction at Gildersome spur. As such road traffic is now minimal within this short road length and services only a limited number of properties. However, the road is significantly wide in terms of individual carriageways and footpaths, but has separation between carriageways relating to its previous role in the road network. The road therefore is capable of handling a substantial volume of traffic and links into the wider network via the B135 and A650.

Our clients land is in single family ownership and is available for development in the short term.

The site is suitable for residential development as an infill development opportunity with built development on three sides and in a very urbanised area close to the Motorway network and significant retail park. The site is in a highly sustainable location within Gildersome, a large village that is well served by local services and facilities (2 Primary Schools, nurseries, a Co-operative foodstore, an indian restaurant, various eateries/takeaways, public houses, clubs, a library and community centre and a Sure Start Children's Centre). It is also close to Drighlington which has a similar range of facilities and amenities. It is very close to key bus routes with stops in easy walking distance to the east and the west. There are playing fields to the east and a cricket club to the north. Morley is close by which is a key town in the south of Leeds that is served by a substantial range of schools, shops, leisure, services and facilities. To the immediate south of the Motorway is the Birstall Retail Park.

The site is achievable as it is located in a highly sustainable location and is in single family ownership. The owners are willingly promoting the land for development. The site can come forward for development within 5 years and certainly can be developed during the Plan Period.

Proposed Change

The sites reference 3064 and 3000 should be identified within the Site Allocations plan as 'green' sites as having 'greatest potential to be allocated for housing'.

Representation ID: REP06017 Question Ref: H4

H5: Which Amber sites do you disagree with and why?

Our client owns land within site ref 3064 which is also adjacent to site ref 3000, which are identified as amber sites in the Issues and Options Draft Site Allocations Plan as a 'site which has potential but issues or not favoured as a green site' and considers that the land should be colour coded green as a site that is developable for housing.

NPPF Tests of soundness

Paragraph 182 states:

The Local Plan will be examined by an independent inspector whose role is to assess whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, legal and procedural requirements, and whether it is sound. A local planning authority should submit a plan for examination which it considers is "sound" – namely that it is:

Positively prepared, Justified, Effective and Consistent with national policy.

Justification

The sites are located to the north of Bradford Road, Gildersome. It is in the south of the village. Drighlington is located a short way to the west. The site is within the outer south-west of Leeds District in a highly sustainable location being close to the aforementioned villages with a decent range of services and amenities (schools, local shopping facilities and restaurants), but is easily accessible to Morley, a town that has a wide range of shops, services and amenities. The site is also just to the north of facilities at Birstall Retail Park which provides a range of shops and restaurants as well as a cinema. The site is well located in terms of the local highway network and is close to Junction 27 of the M62 and the M621.

The land can be accessed via existing access points to the north of Bradford Road, an adopted road which formerly constituted the through road from Morley through Drighlington. The road has been more recently stopped prior to the construction of the new Drighlington bypass and the roundabout/major junction at Gildersome spur. As such road traffic is now minimal within this short road length and services only a limited number of properties. However, the road is significantly wide in terms of individual carriageways and footpaths, but has separation between carriageways relating to its previous role in the road network. The road therefore is capable of handling a substantial volume of traffic and links into the wider network via the B135 and A650.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3000

Housing

Land at Bradford Road Gildersome

Name: Neil Dawson

Representor No: PRS05884

Representation ID: REP06563 Question Ref: H4

Suggested sites from Amber to Red;

309
1067B
1069
1143F
1220A
1274
1275A
1279
1332
2105
2155
3000
3064
3078A
4004

These sites are almost all located within the existing Green Belt and expansion into the Green Belt would lead to increased urban sprawl between the various townships in the Outer South West, and lead to coalescence between communities

Development of the Green Belt sites would also reduce the open green area and provide encroachment into the countryside around Morley and other smaller townships.

In addition there is insufficient road capacity and little scope for expansion for other necessary services. There would be a requirement for new or upgrading of existing roads which would therefore favour development on sites that are already located within the Morley or the Leeds Urban areas rather than eroding the Green Belt further.

Site 3078A is close to potential development in Kirklees and could lead to the complete erosion of the Green Belt and open green space between Leeds and Kirklees.

Any further development at sites 1275A and 1279 would reduce the Green Belt between the existing residential boundary and the A653 Dewsbury Road to a narrow strip which would put pressure in future years to extend residential use further east.

See rep for full details.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H4

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 4 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' and 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network.

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network)

From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service frequency levels.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites - amber sites are linked to this comment]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3000

Housing

Land at Bradford Road Gildersome

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H4

Disagree with Council's amber assessment, think the site should be green

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H4

Disagree with Council's amber assessment, think the site should be green

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3003

Housing

Land off King Street Drighlington

Name: Susan Bell

Representor No: PRS00137

Representation ID: REP00909 Question Ref: H1

3003 - Red. Greenfield site if developed would lead to site 2124 being developed meaning further 250+ houses and cars coming onto King Street.

Name: Elizabeth Mcdermott

Representor No: PRS00140

Representation ID: REP00914 Question Ref: H1

3003 - Green to red. In Green Belt. Concerns about increased traffic on King Street and flooding in Spring Gardens' existing properties.

Name: Brian Guy

Representor No: PRS00142

Representation ID: REP04659 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: A Hampshire

Representor No: PRS00149

Representation ID: REP00923 Question Ref: H1

3003 - Red. There are already several new builds in this area - too many. There are unresolved sewage and flooding problems in this area. School already too small and traffic problems.

Name: Wenda P Whitehead

Representor No: PRS00312

Representation ID: REP04786 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: L. A Mitchell

Representor No: PRS00327

Representation ID: REP02264 Question Ref: H1

3003, 1344, 1077, 333 All sites in Drighlington should be red sites. These are all green belt and should remain as such, there will be no land left in the area. We will be joined to Leeds. Drighlington is no longer a village, there is no infrastructure, roads jammed with traffic, doctors full, no shops, poor sewerage system throughout the village. Roads already full. No schools. We do not want to be an extension of Leeds. The sites are green belt and need to be left as such, to maintain the character of Drighlington. We do not have the infrastructure for any more people or buildings. We had two schools, one has now closed, already the new school has had an extension - so where will all the children go? Why not refurbish the disused mill on Whitehall Road for housing instead of using green field sites?

Name: Doreen Goor

Representor No: PRS00329

Representation ID: REP02274 Question Ref: H1

Green to red. 333/1077/1344/3003 - not enough sewer works to cope with so many houses.

Name: M. J Cousin

Representor No: PRS00330

Representation ID: REP02275 Question Ref: H1

333, 1077, 1344, 3003, 533 - Green to red. The schools are full as are the dentists and health. Not enough shops, services or sewerage systems.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3003

Housing

Land off King Street Drighlington

Name: P And K. H Copley

Representor No: PRS00331

Representation ID: REP02276 Question Ref: H1

Green to red. 333/1077/1344/3003. Infrastructure in village is not suitable. Not enough shops, sewers, services in general, school, nursery's.

Name: J Glazzard

Representor No: PRS00332

Representation ID: REP02277 Question Ref: H1

Green to red. 333/1077/1344/3003 All sites in Drighlington green to red. Please look at the brownfield sites first.

Name: Janice Beever

Representor No: PRS00441

Representation ID: REP04791 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Paul Mountain

Representor No: PRS00515

Representation ID: REP02464 Question Ref: H1

3003 - change from Green to Red - This is not a Brownfield site. Brownfield sites should take priority. This development would increase traffic on the A650, which required a bypass some years ago to alleviate traffic.

Name: A Thornton

Representor No: PRS00524

Representation ID: REP02474 Question Ref: H1

3003 - Change from Green to Red – As once again in my opinion there are in my opinion sufficient brown field sites available across Leeds to accommodate the site capacity suggested.

Name: Elaine Thorton

Representor No: PRS00584

Representation ID: REP02542 Question Ref: H1

3003 - Land at Spring Gardens Drighlington. Green to Red as once again there are in our opinion sufficient brown field sites available across Leeds to accommodate the site capacity suggested.

Name: P S Barrie

Representor No: PRS00915

Representation ID: REP04769 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Representation ID: REP04781 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Representation ID: REP04810 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3003

Housing

Land off King Street Drighlington

Name: Christine Clayton

Representor No: PRS01085

Representation ID: REP03149 Question Ref: H1

3003 Spring Gardens Drighlington - Green to Red

Too much development in Drighlington. Would join with Gildersome to become one large area.

Name: David Clayton

Representor No: PRS01089

Representation ID: REP03153 Question Ref: H1

3003 Spring Gardens Drighlington, Green to Red

There has already been too much development around the village which is in danger of losing its identity due to over development.

Name: Lynne Paul

Representor No: PRS01169

Representation ID: REP04800 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: D Paul

Representor No: PRS01183

Representation ID: REP04793 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: R Finnigan

Representor No: PRS01187

Representation ID: REP03285 Question Ref: H1

3003 - Green to Red. Housing demand can be served by using the 21,000 planning permissions already granted and not yet built and returning the 12,000 empty homes in Leeds back into circulation. Brownfield sites to be used up before use of green field sites.

Name: B Stringer

Representor No: PRS01606

Representation ID: REP04797 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: L.e Beever

Representor No: PRS01607

Representation ID: REP04804 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: J Cowie

Representor No: PRS02227

Representation ID: REP04768 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3003

Housing

Land off King Street Drighlington

Name: Susan Holt

Representor No: PRS02289

Representation ID: REP04772 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Dereck Holt

Representor No: PRS02311

Representation ID: REP04766 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Jenni Davenport

Representor No: PRS02330

Representation ID: REP04770 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Frank Raven

Representor No: PRS02339

Representation ID: REP04771 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: E Naylor

Representor No: PRS02363

Representation ID: REP04780 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Kathleen Paver

Representor No: PRS02372

Representation ID: REP04774 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: C Guy

Representor No: PRS02377

Representation ID: REP04767 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: C Clegg

Representor No: PRS02406

Representation ID: REP04663 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3003

Housing

Land off King Street Drighlington

Name: Doreen Gill

Representor No: PRS02496

Representation ID: REP04755 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: D Naylor

Representor No: PRS02497

Representation ID: REP04773 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: A Paver

Representor No: PRS02498

Representation ID: REP04775 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: James Bowers

Representor No: PRS02500

Representation ID: REP04777 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Alan Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02501

Representation ID: REP04778 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Vivienne Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02502

Representation ID: REP04779 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Vivian Oxtoby

Representor No: PRS02504

Representation ID: REP04783 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Beryl Hewitt

Representor No: PRS02506

Representation ID: REP04785 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3003

Housing

Land off King Street Drighlington

Name: D A Clegg

Representor No: PRS02507

Representation ID: REP04788 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Pauline Wood

Representor No: PRS02508

Representation ID: REP04790 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Joyce Thompson

Representor No: PRS02510

Representation ID: REP04792 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Patricia Aston

Representor No: PRS02513

Representation ID: REP04796 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: L. G Wilson

Representor No: PRS02515

Representation ID: REP04799 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: S Laurence

Representor No: PRS02517

Representation ID: REP04801 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: C Graham

Representor No: PRS02518

Representation ID: REP04803 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: M Allsop

Representor No: PRS02520

Representation ID: REP04805 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3003

Housing

Land off King Street Drighlington

Name: R Hartill

Representor No: PRS02521

Representation ID: REP04806 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Edith Holmes

Representor No: PRS02522

Representation ID: REP04808 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Harry Holmes

Representor No: PRS02524

Representation ID: REP04811 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Ann Morse

Representor No: PRS02526

Representation ID: REP04813 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: L.r Morse

Representor No: PRS02527

Representation ID: REP04816 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Michael Hartill

Representor No: PRS02556

Representation ID: REP04847 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Jim Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02561

Representation ID: REP04852 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Helen Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02562

Representation ID: REP04855 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3003

Housing

Land off King Street Drighlington

Name: Ronald Gill

Representor No: PRS02564

Representation ID: REP04858 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: A.w Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02565

Representation ID: REP04859 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: J Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02566

Representation ID: REP04860 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Norman Dearden

Representor No: PRS02568

Representation ID: REP04857 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: David Blockley

Representor No: PRS02668

Representation ID: REP05119 Question Ref: H1

3003

Traffic from this site is into Drighlington causing congestion problems in the village, which is a major disadvantage.

Name: Angela Blockley

Representor No: PRS02674

Representation ID: REP05125 Question Ref: H1

3003

Access from this site is taking traffic straight into Drighlington village, which is why the bypass was constructed to alleviate this problem.

Name: Arthur Thornton

Representor No: PRS02730

Representation ID: REP05188 Question Ref: H1

Land at Spring Gardens Drighlington. Green to Red as once again there are in our opinion sufficient brown field sites available across Leeds to accommodate the site capacity suggested.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3003

Housing

Land off King Street Drighlington

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 4 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' and 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network.

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network)

From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service frequency levels.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites - green sites are linked to this comment]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H1

Agree with green allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H1

Agree with green allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: Peter Ashton

Representor No: PRS00130

Representation ID: REP04606 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: Brian Guy

Representor No: PRS00142

Representation ID: REP04161 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that,those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: Kathleen Davis

Representor No: PRS00188

Representation ID: REP04521 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: Beverley Henry

Representor No: PRS01121

Representation ID: REP04165 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that,those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: P Coates

Representor No: PRS01948

Representation ID: REP04130 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first it appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: E Kamis

Representor No: PRS01961

Representation ID: REP04146 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that,those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: D Rigby

Representor No: PRS01971

Representation ID: REP04142 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that,those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: B Smith

Representor No: PRS01978

Representation ID: REP04622 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33
137B Britannia Road 87
141 Tingley Common 36
1018A Topcliffe lane 231
3077A Rein Road 246
3077B Rein Road 124
1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Representation ID: REP04174 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33
137B Britannia Road 87
141 Tingley Common 36
1018A Topcliffe lane 231
3077A Rein Road 246
3077B Rein Road 124
1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that,those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: M Webster

Representor No: PRS01980

Representation ID: REP04176 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that,those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: P Carter

Representor No: PRS01986

Representation ID: REP04178 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that,those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: D Carter

Representor No: PRS01992

Representation ID: REP04188 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that,those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: Elaine Carter

Representor No: PRS01998

Representation ID: REP04194 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that,those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: Robert Hall

Representor No: PRS02009

Representation ID: REP04208 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that,those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: Emma Price

Representor No: PRS02222

Representation ID: REP04456 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: J Cowie

Representor No: PRS02227

Representation ID: REP04458 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: James Mallinson

Representor No: PRS02229

Representation ID: REP04466 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: J Middleton

Representor No: PRS02231

Representation ID: REP04468 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: Barnes

Representor No: PRS02236

Representation ID: REP04471 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: Wormald

Representor No: PRS02238

Representation ID: REP04476 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: T White

Representor No: PRS02241

Representation ID: REP04479 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: Brian Dykes

Representor No: PRS02246

Representation ID: REP04482 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: Barrett

Representor No: PRS02248

Representation ID: REP04486 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: K Batley

Representor No: PRS02249

Representation ID: REP04487 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: M Farnhill

Representor No: PRS02261

Representation ID: REP04501 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: Sandra And Arthur Gawthorpe

Representor No: PRS02265

Representation ID: REP04504 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: P Batley

Representor No: PRS02269

Representation ID: REP04508 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: Ann Raistrick

Representor No: PRS02282

Representation ID: REP04524 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: L Leatherly
Representor No: PRS02285

Representation ID: REP04526 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.
I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.
SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:
137A Britannia Road 33
137B Britannia Road 87
141 Tingley Common 36
1018A Topcliffe lane 231
3077A Rein Road 246
3077B Rein Road 124
1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16
The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: Helen Ainley

Representor No: PRS02288

Representation ID: REP04528 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: Susan Holt

Representor No: PRS02289

Representation ID: REP04532 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: Dereck Holt

Representor No: PRS02311

Representation ID: REP04555 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: S Pickering

Representor No: PRS02312

Representation ID: REP04557 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: Anne And Alan Britton

Representor No: PRS02313

Representation ID: REP04558 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: Helen Guy

Representor No: PRS02314

Representation ID: REP04559 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: R Platt

Representor No: PRS02316

Representation ID: REP04563 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: David Stott

Representor No: PRS02317

Representation ID: REP04565 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: S Roberts

Representor No: PRS02319

Representation ID: REP04567 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: M McNicholl

Representor No: PRS02321

Representation ID: REP04570 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: Jason Beecroft

Representor No: PRS02326

Representation ID: REP04573 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: Peter Newsome

Representor No: PRS02328

Representation ID: REP04577 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: Jenni Davenport

Representor No: PRS02330

Representation ID: REP04580 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: P Sutton

Representor No: PRS02333

Representation ID: REP04583 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: Stephen And Janice Duffy

Representor No: PRS02337

Representation ID: REP04586 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: A Glen

Representor No: PRS02338

Representation ID: REP04588 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: Frank Raven

Representor No: PRS02339

Representation ID: REP04589 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: Kudlip Kawz

Representor No: PRS02358

Representation ID: REP04607 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: Carole Deighton

Representor No: PRS02362

Representation ID: REP04613 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: E Naylor

Representor No: PRS02363

Representation ID: REP04616 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: Ava D Platt

Representor No: PRS02370

Representation ID: REP04624 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: Kathleen Paver

Representor No: PRS02372

Representation ID: REP04626 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: Diane Taylor-reid

Representor No: PRS02374

Representation ID: REP04627 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: C Guy

Representor No: PRS02377

Representation ID: REP04630 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: Howard Boyce

Representor No: PRS02384

Representation ID: REP04641 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: J Beldon

Representor No: PRS02385

Representation ID: REP04642 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: A W Cooper

Representor No: PRS02387

Representation ID: REP04644 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: Luke Standage

Representor No: PRS02389

Representation ID: REP04646 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: K And C Morrison

Representor No: PRS02397

Representation ID: REP04655 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: G Oxtoby

Representor No: PRS02505

Representation ID: REP07814 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: K Horner

Representor No: PRS02512

Representation ID: REP04789 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: J W Crabtree

Representor No: PRS02514

Representation ID: REP04794 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: Harry Vasey

Representor No: PRS02529

Representation ID: REP07823 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: B F Thompson

Representor No: PRS02531

Representation ID: REP04814 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: Charles Ollis

Representor No: PRS02532

Representation ID: REP04820 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: S Gamble

Representor No: PRS02535

Representation ID: REP04821 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: Jonathan Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02563

Representation ID: REP07833 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: S. R Searle

Representor No: PRS02649

Representation ID: REP05094 Question Ref: H7

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Angela Mallinson

Representor No: PRS02650

Representation ID: REP05095 Question Ref: H7

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: Katrina Whitbread

Representor No: PRS04446

Representation ID: REP00553 Question Ref: H3

3387,1112,343 & 3007 would it seem have minimal impact on residents and most of it is set in an industrial area

Representation ID: REP00553 Question Ref: H6

3387,1112,343 & 3007/3039 would it seem have minimal impact on residents and most of it is set in an industrial area

Representation ID: REP00553 Question Ref: H7

3387,1112,343 & 3007/3039 would it seem have minimal impact on residents and most of it is set in an industrial area

Representation ID: REP00553 Question Ref: H12

3007/3039

Representation ID: REP00870 Question Ref: G1

The proposal represents an inappropriate form of development within the Green Belt and in the absence of any special circumstances would by its inappropriateness have a harmful impact on the open, rural and undeveloped character of the Green Belt.

Representation ID: REP00870 Question Ref: G3

3039,3007 & 343

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust

Representor No: PRS05780

Representation ID: REP06462 Question Ref: H7

I am writing on behalf of our client, Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust, in response to the consultation on the Issues and Options version of the Site Allocations Plan, and in particular a parcel of land off Wakefield Road in Gildersome. The site is referenced 3007, CFSM040 and 2301611.

The site was allocated in the Unitary Development Plan under reference E3B:7 for industry/warehousing and ancillary offices. The current consultation document includes details of the site under Table 10.4.1 of Volume 2, document 10 – Outer South West which lists "sites for office development." It appears the site has been included in this table because planning permission was granted under reference 23/360/03/RE for office development. The table is quite right to note the permission has now lapsed and to reflect the most up to date status of the land at the time the consultation was drafted.

There does however appear to be some conflicts within Volume 2, document 10 - Outer South West which shows the site to be rejected for a mixed use scheme on Plan 10.3, but then shows the site to benefit from planning permission/allocation for a mixed use scheme on Plan 10.4 and be identified for office development under Table 10.4.1.

Irrespective of the content of the current consultation document, we wish to bring to your attention how events have now moved on again. Since the consultation document was published Planning Committee has resolved to grant planning permission for a mixed use scheme comprising B1, B2, C1, A3 and A4 uses under reference 10/04597/OT subject to the signing of a Section 106 Agreement. The intention to grant planning permission means that details of the site under Table 10.4.1 of Volume 2, document 10 are now out of date and incorrect, especially given the predominant use is no longer for offices. We expect planning permission to be confirmed after 9th August.

Once the site has a valid planning permission it becomes a 'commitment' and part of the Council's supply of land. As you will be aware, the allocation of land is only required where a site does not benefit from planning permission in order to establish the principle of development is acceptable and to establish a future supply of land for development. Where a site has planning permission then not only has the principle been established, but the status of the site as part of the Councils' land supply has been confirmed. We therefore believe details of the site only need to be noted as part of the Council's supply of land. Once planning permission has been confirmed, the site will not therefore need to be specifically allocated within the Local Plan for development. This point also applies to other sites within the document (and listed under Table 10.4.1 and 10.4.2) that have planning permission and therefore do not need to be specifically allocated for development. On the basis of the process for preparing Local Plans, we hope the list of commitments under Table 10.4.1 and 10.4.2 is simply to provide an explanation of those sites that contribute to the land supply rather than the Council's intention to allocate the land in the Site Allocations Plan. The list will however need to be updated as the process progresses.

In terms of those sites which were allocated in the UDP, but do not benefit from planning permission, there is an additional point to make in terms of procedures for preparing Local Plans. The point is that previous allocations cannot simply be carried forward. It is necessary to undertake an assessment to determine the deliverability of the sites in order to determine whether they will contribute to the land supply during the Plan period or should in fact be deleted because they are unlikely to come forward. In the case of the Leeds Site Allocations Plan it is also necessary to undertake such an assessment of UDP allocations to be carried forward because the sites have not previously been subjected to the necessary Sustainability Appraisal.

We do however appreciate that where planning permission has expired then it is appropriate to allocate land in order to re-establish the principle of development. This is however no longer the case with the land off Wakefield Road, Gildersome.

We will write again once planning permission has been confirmed in order to update you on the situation.

I hope you will reflect the points made in this letter in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3007

Housing

Land At M621 Junction 27 And Wakefield Road Gildersome Leeds

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network. From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3056

Housing

Wood Lane, Farnley

Name: Richard Marshall

Representor No: PRS03170

Representation ID: REP01024 Question Ref: H4

2098C, 2105, 2155, 3000, 3056,3064, 3078A, 4004, and 4029. As previously stated the amber sites that are greenbelt land should not be considered for development.

Representation ID: REP01024 Question Ref: H5

1079, 1072, 1077, 1143B, 1143D, 1171B, 1200A, 1258, 1284a, 1285, 1344, 2098a, 3365, 3456A.2098C, 2105, 2155, 3000, 3056,3064, 3078A, 4004, and 4029. As previously stated the amber sites that are greenbelt land should not be considered for development. Site 1032 is designated as a protected area of search this land has been retained along the edge of the existing settlement pending more suitable sites being found in the longer term this site should only be developed as a last resort.

Name: Hoare

Representor No: PRS05410

Representation ID: REP06016 Question Ref: H4

3056 – Land to the south of Gelderd Road, Wortley

4.26 The site is currently in agricultural use and is set amongst a collection of other proposed allocations. The brief assessment carried out by the council suggests that the site is reliant upon a link road from Whitehall Road in the east to Gelderd Road to the west.

4.27 The site is currently located within the Green Belt and there is the clear potential for further urban sprawl into the fields further south.

Recommendation – reclassify as 'red' due to the obvious lack of a defensible boundary and therefore its potentially damaging impact on the Green Belt.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3056

Housing

Wood Lane, Farnley

Name: Neil Dawson

Representor No: PRS05884

Representation ID: REP06563 Question Ref: H4

The current number of sites required in the Outer South West is 7,200 and not withstanding my comments above on the overall numbers I would suggest the following changes to site allocations.

The total green and amber housing sites allocated in Outer South West is 9,653 whereas the plan is seeking 5,586 residential units. 1,614 housing units already have planning permission. There is therefore scope to increase the number of housing sites allocated as Red which are therefore not considered suitable for housing allocation.

There are two underlying reasons for revising the allocation of sites from Green and Amber to Red.

Firstly to protect the existing Green Belt around Morley and the Green Belt around smaller settlements in the Outer South West. In particular to restrict the sprawl of large built up areas and to prevent Morley and smaller settlements from merging to existing townships.

Secondly in my submission to the LDF in April 2012 I identified the Beeston Royds area in Outer South West as an area suitable for further significant housing development. This area is on the edge of the main urban area of Leeds. It has very good existing road links (the A61, A58 and the A6110) and it is close to the M621/M62.

There is a mixture of employment and residential use in the area and careful planning in the area should allow both employment and residential developments to take place for the duration of the plan.

Suggested sites to move from Amber to Green;

141
2078
3056
3386
4029

Site 141 is currently in employment use but is a brownfield site and as such should be considered for residential development ahead of other potential Greenfield sites.

The sites 3056, 2078, 4029 and 3386 are located in the Beeston Royds area in Farnley and Wortley ward and should be considered for residential development.

These sites could link with existing development in the area which is part of the main Leeds urban area. These developments will require a new road linking Gelderd Road and Whitehall Road but given the number of housing units this should be economically viable. The area would then have good access to the existing road network, at the Leeds Outer Ring Road and the M621/M62. It is close to retail facilities at Junction One, the White Rose Centre plus local shops in Lower Wortley. There is also potential for primary school development in the area if the total number of sites is expanded.

See rep for full details

Name: Liongate Developments Limited

Representor No: PRS06410

Representation ID: REP07389 Question Ref: H4

Site 3056 — Wood Lane. Farnley [to red]

The site is currently in agricultural use and is set amongst a collection of other proposed allocations. The brief assessment carried out by the council suggests that the site is reliant upon a link road from Whitehall Road in the east to Gelderd Road to the west. The site is currently located within the Green Belt and there is the clear potential for further urban sprawl into the fields further south.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3056

Housing

Wood Lane, Farnley

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H4

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Amber Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are be minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H4

Disagree with Council's amber assessment, think the site should be red

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H4

Disagree with Council's amber assessment, think the site should be red

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3057

Housing

Cottingley Springs, Gelderd Road

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3058

Housing

Land North of Dean Beck (Including Cottingley Springs) Gildersome

Name: Richard Coldron

Representor No: PRS04196

Representation ID: REP00327 Question Ref: H3

3060, 3387, 1112, 3059, 3058 Should be green. Ideal opportunity to extend village towards city and green a new community. Road network (Gelderd Road) has low traffic flows due to parallel M621 and would be capable of sustaining more traffic.

Representation ID: REP00327 Question Ref: H8

3060, 3059, 3058 Ideal area to extend a village towards city centre. Empty roads and chance to build infrastructure.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3059

Housing

Land between Gelderd and M621 Wortley

Name: Richard Coldron

Representor No: PRS04196

Representation ID: REP00327 Question Ref: H3

3060, 3387, 1112, 3059, 3058 Should be green. Ideal opportunity to extend village towards city and green a new community. Road network (Gelderd Road) has low traffic flows due to parallel M621 and would be capable of sustaining more traffic.

Representation ID: REP00327 Question Ref: H8

3060, 3059, 3058 Ideal area to extend a village towards city centre. Empty roads and chance to build infrastructure.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3060

Housing

Gelderd Road/M621, Gildersome

Name: Richard Coldron

Representor No: PRS04196

Representation ID: REP00327 Question Ref: H3

3060, 3387, 1112, 3059, 3058Should be green.Ideal opportunity to extend village towards city and green a new community.Road network (Gelderd Road) has low traffic flows due to parallel M621 and would be capable of sustaining more traffic.

Representation ID: REP00327 Question Ref: H8

3060, 3059, 3058Ideal area to extend a village towards city centre. Empty roads and chance to build infrastructure.

Representation ID: REP00327 Question Ref: H11

3060, 3387, 1112 all short term

Name: Ian Bond

Representor No: PRS04507

Representation ID: REP05925 Question Ref: H11

3360Cookridge Hall Green Belt S

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3060

Housing

Gelderd Road/M621, Gildersome

Name: Taylor Wimpey

Representor No: PRS05758

Representation ID: REP06414 Question Ref: H7

We object to the rating of site reference 3060 as Red (sites not considered suitable to be allocated for housing). Our objection relates to parcel 3060, which is to the north of Asquith Avenue and to the east of Gelderd Road, Gildersome. This site was submitted to the Site Allocations DPD during the Call for Sites Process and again as a response to the draft Core Strategy in April 2012. It extends to approximately 10 ha and forms the southern section of site reference 3060. We object to the amalgamation of a number of sites into site reference 3060 which has a total site area of 120 hectares and has been deemed not suitable for housing by Leeds City Council. We believe that Leeds City Council have misinterpreted the specific potential of the land at Gelderd Road and Asquith Avenue and that this land (as originally submitted) should be given a Green rating and allocated for housing for the reasons set out below. Taylor Wimpey are committed to developing this site for housing. The Concept Plan appended to this statement proposes the retention of the fields to the north of the hotel as a public open space facility. This further assists in divorcing this SHLAA site from those to the north.

Green Belt Review

To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas

The site is well connected to the built up area. The western boundary is residential development, to the south west is a restaurant and industrial area and it is contained by trees and the M621 motorway to the east.

To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another

Development would not lead to neighbouring towns merging into one another as the site is bounded to the west by residential development, to the east by trees and the M621 motorway and to the south by existing development and the employment allocation. Development of this site would not lead to ribbon development and would not result in isolated development.

To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

The site does not perform a significant role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The site is a distinct enclave rather than a wide tract of open countryside.

To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

The site is not within or adjacent to a Conservation Area, listed building or other historical feature. Development of this site would have no effect on the setting and special character of historic features.

To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land

Spatial Policy 1 of the Core Strategy advises that an appropriate balance of greenfield and brownfield land will be necessary to deliver the spatial development strategy. There are few derelict and brownfield sites available within the Outer South West housing market area; therefore the development of greenfield sites will be necessary in order to meet the housing requirement in the draft Core Strategy and a number of these are likely to be on land currently designated as Green Belt.

This site has been wrongly bundled with a much larger area of Green Belt which is more distant from the settlement edge. The removal of the subject land from the Green Belt can deliver future development which meets all of the key attributes of sustainability – economic, social and environmental.

The site and location characteristics are wholly capable of providing the following benefits which will cumulatively contribute to sustainable development: -

- ☐ The siting of new homes close to existing and future employment sites. Within a very short commuting radius of under 3kms there are substantial zones of existing and likely future employment. This provides major potential to reduce the length of commuting journeys and encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport.
- ☐ The subject land is capable of providing elements of a mixed use development including the potential for a new local centre providing for the daily needs of existing and new residents as well as local employees. This potential is significant given the lack of such services in Gildersome.
- ☐ With the exception of the designated Local Nature Area and the areas of woodland on its boundaries the subject site is of no particular environmental or visual quality. As part of a future well planned development there is potential to enhance the local environment and biodiversity.
- ☐ The future development can be planned so that connectivity with the surrounding countryside is improved to the benefit of the health and well being of existing and future residents.
- ☐ The scale of the site's development capacity means that it will be capable of benefiting from on or near site sustainable energy generation.
- ☐ The site is outside flood risk zones 2 and 3 and is not subject to any significant environmental or physical constraints which will preclude the achievement of sustainable development.
- ☐ The scale of the potential residential development can provide for a wide choice of high quality homes, including affordable housing in an inclusive and mixed community.

Consequently this subject site can be developed in a sustainable way via its close physical and potential social, economic and environmental connections with the nearby urban areas of Gildersome and Morley. The development of this site can be well contained and avoid any element of urban sprawl into the wider open countryside. The main functions of the Green Belt identified at paragraph 80 of the NPPF can be maintained. The potential 'fit' of development in this locality with the urban form of Morley/Gildersome is very good indeed.

A development masterplan has been submitted with this response to demonstrate how the site could be developed. This illustrates the retention of the northern fields as POS with proposed footpath connections.

This area of land is extremely well located to contribute to this urban extension element of the requirement in the Outer South West housing market area due to its sustainable attributes and excellent fit with the urban area. It is located close to existing facilities and services in Morley and Gildersome including shops, schools and healthcare facilities. It is also well located to access regular bus and train services as well as trips on foot and by cycle.

There are no significant on site constraints which would preclude development; vehicular access can be provided from either Gelderd Road and/or Asquith Avenue. It is however envisaged that access from Asquith Avenue will be the preferred solution. The established tree belts provide a

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3060

Housing

Gelderd Road/M621, Gildersome

Name: Taylor Wimpey

Representor No: PRS05758

framework for Green Belt release and there are no adverse levels which would inhibit development.

The site is deliverable when considered against the definition of deliverable in the Framework (footnote 11 of paragraph 47). The site is available now given the agreement in place between the landowners and a national housebuilder. The site is in a sustainable location, suitable for the delivery of housing as detailed in this response. There are no insurmountable physical problems or limitations and as such the site is considered to be suitable for housing. It is considered that this is an achievable site, which has a realistic prospect of being delivered within 5 to 7 years; there are no known viability issues restricting the site from coming forward.

For the reasons set out above, we support the housing allocation of that part of site reference 3060 as shown on the attached concept plan.

See rep for full details.

Representation ID: REP06414 Question Ref: H11

The site is available now given the agreement in place between the landowners and a national housebuilder. The site is in a sustainable location, suitable for the delivery of housing as detailed in this response. There are no insurmountable physical problems or limitations and as such the site is considered to be suitable for housing. It is considered that this is an achievable site, which has a realistic prospect of being delivered within 5 to 7 years; there are no known viability issues restricting the site from coming forward.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3061

Housing

Cricket Hill Brow, Gelderd Road, Gildersome

Name: Michael Long
Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network. From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee
Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Name: Tom Leadley
Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3062

Housing

Harthill Rise, Gildersome

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network. From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3063

Housing

Land north of Harthill Lane, Gildersome

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network. From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3064

Housing

Greystone Farm/Bungalow, Wakefield Road, Drighlington

Name: Brian Guy

Representor No: PRS00142

Representation ID: REP04659 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Wenda P Whitehead

Representor No: PRS00312

Representation ID: REP04786 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Janice Beever

Representor No: PRS00441

Representation ID: REP04791 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Jennifer Adams

Representor No: PRS00456

Representation ID: REP02404 Question Ref: H5

3064 – I object to the proposal of the building on this green belt site. The proposed buildings would destroy all the natural wildlife which lives in the area. This site has no natural defendable boundary and would join two separate areas.

Name: Susan Wood

Representor No: PRS00739

Representation ID: REP02742 Question Ref: H4

3064 – No – This would join two villages creating more urban sprawl. Indefensible boundaries. Site used by walkers and abundant wildlife including 'grasshopper warblers'. This site abuts schools and nurseries and could have a detrimental effect on children's health. Good open green space.

Name: P S Barrie

Representor No: PRS00915

Representation ID: REP04769 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Representation ID: REP04810 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Representation ID: REP04781 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3064

Housing

Greystone Farm/Bungalow, Wakefield Road, Drighlington

Name: Lynne Paul

Representor No: PRS01169

Representation ID: REP04800 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: D Paul

Representor No: PRS01183

Representation ID: REP04793 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Geraldine Hoare

Representor No: PRS01300

Representation ID: REP03409 Question Ref: H4

3064 - No - should be red.
No defendable boundary.
Joins two settlements.
Good wildlife.
Used by walkers - along the footpaths.
Good open space.
Good agricultural land.

Name: Pamela Adams

Representor No: PRS01318

Representation ID: REP03428 Question Ref: H5

3064 – I live adjacent to site 3064 and object to the proposal of building on the grounds of:
The proposed site is green belt and a natural valley with lots of wildlife which would be destroyed if planning went ahead.
This site would not have a defendable boundary and would destroy and spoil the natural landscape.

Name: B Stringer

Representor No: PRS01606

Representation ID: REP04797 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: L.e Beever

Representor No: PRS01607

Representation ID: REP04804 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: J Cowie

Representor No: PRS02227

Representation ID: REP04768 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3064

Housing

Greystone Farm/Bungalow, Wakefield Road, Drighlington

Name: Susan Holt

Representor No: PRS02289

Representation ID: REP04772 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Dereck Holt

Representor No: PRS02311

Representation ID: REP04766 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Jenni Davenport

Representor No: PRS02330

Representation ID: REP04770 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Frank Raven

Representor No: PRS02339

Representation ID: REP04771 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: E Naylor

Representor No: PRS02363

Representation ID: REP04780 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Kathleen Paver

Representor No: PRS02372

Representation ID: REP04774 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: C Guy

Representor No: PRS02377

Representation ID: REP04767 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3064

Housing

Greystone Farm/Bungalow, Wakefield Road, Drighlington

Name: C Clegg

Representor No: PRS02406

Representation ID: REP04663 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Doreen Gill

Representor No: PRS02496

Representation ID: REP04755 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: D Naylor

Representor No: PRS02497

Representation ID: REP04773 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: A Paver

Representor No: PRS02498

Representation ID: REP04775 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: James Bowers

Representor No: PRS02500

Representation ID: REP04777 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Alan Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02501

Representation ID: REP04778 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Vivienne Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02502

Representation ID: REP04779 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3064

Housing

Greystone Farm/Bungalow, Wakefield Road, Drighlington

Name: Vivian Oxtoby

Representor No: PRS02504

Representation ID: REP04783 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Beryl Hewitt

Representor No: PRS02506

Representation ID: REP04785 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: D A Clegg

Representor No: PRS02507

Representation ID: REP04788 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Pauline Wood

Representor No: PRS02508

Representation ID: REP04790 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Joyce Thompson

Representor No: PRS02510

Representation ID: REP04792 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Patricia Aston

Representor No: PRS02513

Representation ID: REP04796 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: L. G Wilson

Representor No: PRS02515

Representation ID: REP04799 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3064

Housing

Greystone Farm/Bungalow, Wakefield Road, Drighlington

Name: S Laurence

Representor No: PRS02517

Representation ID: REP04801 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: C Graham

Representor No: PRS02518

Representation ID: REP04803 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: M Allsop

Representor No: PRS02520

Representation ID: REP04805 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: R Hartill

Representor No: PRS02521

Representation ID: REP04806 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Edith Holmes

Representor No: PRS02522

Representation ID: REP04808 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Harry Holmes

Representor No: PRS02524

Representation ID: REP04811 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Ann Morse

Representor No: PRS02526

Representation ID: REP04813 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3064

Housing

Greystone Farm/Bungalow, Wakefield Road, Drighlington

Name: L.r Morse

Representor No: PRS02527

Representation ID: REP04816 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Michael Hartill

Representor No: PRS02556

Representation ID: REP04847 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Jim Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02561

Representation ID: REP04852 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Helen Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02562

Representation ID: REP04855 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Ronald Gill

Representor No: PRS02564

Representation ID: REP04858 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: A.w Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02565

Representation ID: REP04859 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: J Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02566

Representation ID: REP04860 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North
Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3064

Housing

Greystone Farm/Bungalow, Wakefield Road, Drighlington

Name: Norman Dearden

Representor No: PRS02568

Representation ID: REP04857 Question Ref: H4

3064 Birchfield Ave Gildersome, Site Capacity 401, Ward Morley North

Green belt site which acts as a buffer between Gildersome and Drighlington. There are access problems with these sites and the local infrastructure cannot cope with this scale of development.

Name: Russell Doherty

Representor No: PRS02666

Representation ID: REP05118 Question Ref: H4

3064 Ady to Birchfield School

This should not be for housing joining two areas. Good open space – providing walking and wildlife. Also, no defendable boundary – so could sprawl into rest of greenbelt.

Name: Claire Woodhead

Representor No: PRS02678

Representation ID: REP05129 Question Ref: H4

3064

The site is good corn agricultural land. It has no defendable boundary. It is a quiet road which would incur extra traffic. Small local primary school. I have good knowledge of the area. It backs on to open countryside.

Name: Elizabeth Marshall

Representor No: PRS02721

Representation ID: REP05178 Question Ref: H4

I feel a site of this size leading onto street Lane would be very adverse. Traffic regular queues from the traffic lights at the main road intersections (M62, M621 and A650) well past East View, cars parked at Beechfield School compound the situation. Where would the access be?

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3064

Housing

Greystone Farm/Bungalow, Wakefield Road, Drighlington

Name: Liongate Developments Ltd

Representor No: PRS03010

Representation ID: REP05579 Question Ref: H4

These representations relating to the above document have been prepared by Barton Willmore on behalf of our client, Liongate Developments Limited ("LDL") in relation to land adjacent to Birchfield Primary School, Birchfield Avenue, Gildersome (hereafter referred to as 'the Site').

Background

The Site Allocations Plan will form part of Leeds City Council's development plan and will allocate sufficient sites to meet the city's housing, employment and retail needs throughout the next 15 years, in accordance with the Council's overarching strategic document, the Core Strategy. The Issues and Options draft outlines initial ideas for the potential allocations to meet the Council's needs and the comments of the general public and relevant stakeholders are sought regarding these initial allocations.

The extent of our client's land broadly corresponds to Site 3064 within the Site Allocations Plan. These representations detail how the land would make a sustainable site for additional housing within this area of Leeds and in doing so would assist in the Council in meeting its future housing targets.

The rest of these representations are structured as follows:

- A description of the site and surroundings;
- An overview of the planning policy context (including background evidence that has fed into the draft Site Allocations Plan);
- An assessment of the Site's potential for future residential development;
- Assessment of other potential housing allocations in the Gildersome area; and
- Summary and Conclusions.

The Site and its Surroundings

The Site is situated to the south and west of Gildersome and 7.8km to the south west of Leeds City Centre. It currently comprises undulating agricultural land directly adjacent to the built-up area.

The Site is located to the south of Woodhead Lane with Birchfield Primary School and a number of existing residential properties off Street Lane and East View located to the east along with Gildersome Sports Club. To the south lies a mix of residential and employment properties off Bradford Road. Further agricultural uses are found to the west.

Gildersome itself is village suburb of Leeds and is located around 3km to the north west of the town of Morley. The village itself consists predominantly of residential housing estates but does benefit from a number of key services including a GP's surgery, a library, a local foodstore and 2 primary schools.

Planning Policy Context

The National Planning Policy Framework

The National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF") was published in March 2012 and provides a blueprint for how plan-making should be undertaken. At its core the NPPF contains a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Paragraph 7 of the Framework refers to the three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. These dimensions are said to give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles:

- An economic role — contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth;
- A social role — supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; and
- An environmental role — contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently.

Paragraph 17 of the NPPF outlines the twelve core land-use planning principles that should underpin plan-making. The third principle states that planning should "proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs".

Specifically in terms of housing, Paragraph 47 of the NPPF states that in undertaking plan-making, local planning authorities should seek to significantly boost the supply of housing within their area and "use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full and objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area". It also outlines that local planning authorities must ensure that identified land is deliverable and defines this as:

"....be[ing] available now, offer[ing] a suitable location for development now, and be[ing] achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and in particular that development of the site is viable".

Paragraph 52 further notes that the "supply of new homes can sometimes be best achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as new settlements or extensions to existing villages and towns...".

In respect of Green Belt, the NPPF outlines that a review of Green Belt boundaries can be undertaken through the plan making process and that "when drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should be taken account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development".

The purpose of the Green Belt is then subsequently detailed in Paragraph 80 and that is:

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3064

Housing

Greystone Farm/Bungalow, Wakefield Road, Drighlington

Name: Liongate Developments Ltd

Representor No: PRS03010

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

As part of the requirement to support sustainable development Paragraph 34 of the NPPF states that plans should ensure developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised.

Leeds Unitary Development Plan

The Unitary Development Plan ("UDP") was adopted in 2001 and alterations were subsequently made to the plan in 2006 following a review. The UDP forms the Council's current development plan

Within the Leeds UDP the site is designated as part of the Green Belt and as an Urban Fringe Priority Area. The Urban Fringe Priority Area states support will be given to management initiatives to secure environmental improvements, the beneficial use of land and increased public access where this can be appropriately managed.

Emerging Planning Policies

Core Strategy

The Core Strategy was submitted to the Secretary of State for Examination on 26th April 2013 and it is yet to be adopted. However, the Site Allocations DPD aims to achieve the overarching strategic vision for the District that is set out within the Core Strategy.

Spatial Policy 6 of the draft Core Strategy states that in order to identify the proposed housing sites that will meet the Council's housing needs the following considerations will be taken into account:

- Sustainability of location — access to public transport and new and local facilities and services including educational and health;
- Preference for brownfield sites;
- The least impact on Green Belt purposes;
- The ability to improve neighbourhoods through high quality design;
- Consideration for lead-in times and build-out rates for housing construction;
- Impacts on green infrastructure, green corridors, greenspace and nature conservation; and
- Potential flood risk.

Spatial Policy 10 of the draft Core Strategy acknowledges that a Green Belt review is required in order to ensure that the Council's housing target of 66,000 new dwellings can be achieved. The policy states that Green Belt release will be considered in the following areas:

- The main urban area (Leeds City Centre and surrounding areas forming the main urban and suburban areas of the city);
- Major Settlements; and
- Smaller Settlements

The draft Core Strategy regards Gildersome as falling within the smaller settlements category and so is capable of being included within the review of the Green Belt.

Site Allocations Plan

The Site Allocations Plan Issues and Options draft is subject to this consultation. The residential element of the document has been based on the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment ("SHLAA") undertaken as part of the background evidence to the Council's emerging development plan.

In order to assess the sites that have been put forward for residential use the Site Allocations Plan has adopted a traffic lighting system to identify the most suitable sites. The sites have been listed in one of the following categories:

- Light Green — the site is either allocated or there is an existing planning permission for development of the site;
- Dark Green — sites which have the greatest potential to be allocated for housing;
- Amber — sites which have potential but issues or not favoured as green sites; and
- Red — sites not considered to be suitable for allocation.

Gildersome is located within the Outer South West area where the document proposes to deliver 7,200 new homes throughout the next 15 years. It identifies that there are currently 1,614 dwellings to be built from existing planning permissions and allocations which leaves a residual target of 5,586 dwellings. The dark green sites within the Outer South West area provide a total yield of 4,154 units. For the reasons stated below we dispute these overall housing figures which we believe should be notably higher. Nevertheless even taking into account these published figures, in order for the Council to meet its housing target in this part of the Leeds it will need to consider additional sites; including, where necessary, a review of the Green Belt boundaries.

The Site corresponds to the reference 3064 and is currently designated amber within the draft of Site Allocations Plan with the Council observing that the Site's current Green Belt designation as well as potential issues regarding access are acting as constraints on future development. The analysis is consistent with the SHLAA which notes similar constraints associated with the site.

With this in mind we consider the site's potential as a future housing allocation below.

Consideration of the Site as a Future Housing Allocation

Principle of a Housing Allocation on the Site

As outlined above, the Core Strategy outlines that the Council must provide 66,000 new homes over the plan period. In this respect we refer to our previous representations to the Core Strategy undertaken by Barton Willmore which object to this proposed housing target, and which detail our

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3064

Housing

Greystone Farm/Bungalow, Wakefield Road, Drighlington

Name: Liongate Developments Ltd

Representor No: PRS03010

concerns that this level of planned growth has not been justified or positively prepared. Based on evidence presented in our representations, we believe there is sound evidence providing justification for a higher overall housing target.

Irrespective of this the Site Allocations Plan will nevertheless need to be prepared in accordance with the NPPF and as such will need to ensure that each site is able to accommodate development that is sustainable. As outlined in our analysis above, even taking into account the current published figures the Outer South West area, the Council will still need to consider some of the other sites in order to meet its housing target. Of these it is clear that the most suitable will be the amber sites of which our client's site is one. It therefore follows that it is necessary to establish the sustainability credentials of the proposed sites to see if they are suitable to take forward as residential allocations as the development plan progresses.

In this respect we regard our client's site as a sustainable option for a future residential allocation on the basis that the Site is well related to the existing built-up area of Gildersome and is in a location that provides easy access to key local services including shops, banks and schools; many within Gildersome itself and others in nearby Morley. The Site is also located in an area with a good public transport service with a bus stop around 250m from the site with services to Leeds City Centre, Huddersfield, Morley, Dewsbury and Birstall (routes 209 and 219). As a result of this it is considered that a housing allocation on the site would be consistent with paragraphs 17, 34, 47 and 52 of the NPPF (detailed above) and draft Spatial Policy 6 of the emerging Core Strategy.

A detailed above, Paragraph 7 of the NPPF identifies three specific but interrelated roles that need to be considered; these are economic, social and environmental. It is considered that in the case of our client's site that it could contribute to all three of these roles by:

- Contributing to building a strong economy by ensuring sufficient land is available for housing which can be utilised by the local workforce, now and in the future and that new residents can help sustain existing local businesses in the area;
- Being capable of delivering much needed housing within this area of Leeds and is capable of offering an appropriate mix of housing sizes and types and so can make a positive impact on social and well-being; and
- Being a relatively unconstrained Site that is capable of addressing any environmental issue that may be associated with its redevelopment.

As such, on a principle level the Site would make a sustainable contribution to housing within the Outer South West Area of Leeds and so should be considered favourably as a housing allocation. Having demonstrated this, we now explore the site specific considerations relating to the Site below.

Site Specific Considerations
The assessment of the Site within the Council's SHLAA, along with the accompanying analysis within the draft Site Allocation Plan generally considers the Site favourably as a future residential allocation. Nevertheless two constraints are noted and are the reason why the Site is currently classified as amber. These constraints are:

- The Site's access
 - The Site's current Green Belt designation.
- We provide our own assessment of these constraints below.

Site Access

To explore site access in more detail we instructed PAH Highway Consultants Ltd to analyse the Site and to assess its potential for providing a safe and acceptable access. Their assessment is appended to this letter as Annex 1 and concludes that a safe and adequate access arrangement can be achieved off Bradford Road to serve residential accommodation and in doing so addresses Paragraph 34 of the NPPF.

This demonstrates that a viable access on to the Site can be achieved and so should no longer be regarded as a constraint when considering it as a future residential allocation.

Green Belt

As part of the Council's emerging development plan, a selective review of the Green Belt is to be undertaken in accordance with draft Spatial Policy 10 of the draft Core Strategy. This will allow the Council to decide which sites would be suitable for removal from the Green Belt to then be allocated for future development. In this regard the Council has already assessed many of the sites within the Site Allocations Plan including our client's land (Site 3064).

The Green Belt assessment covers the criteria outlined within paragraph 80 of the NPPF to ascertain each site's suitability for removal. Overall our client's site performs well when judged against they criteria; in particular the assessment notes that the Site:

- Is well connected to built-up area;
- Has a low potential for unrestricted sprawl;
- Will not result in the merging of two settlements; and
- Provides an opportunity to 'round-off' the settlement.

Nevertheless for completeness we have also undertaken our own Green Belt assessment of the site below using the Council's pro-forma contained in Appendix 1 of the Site Allocations Plan Issues and Options draft. *see pdf of representation*

Our own assessment is consistent with the Council's and concludes that the Site should be favoured for removal from the Green Belt on the basis that it scores well against the above criteria.

Summary of Site Specific Analysis

Our own analysis of the site specific constraints identified show the Site is both capable of providing a sufficient access and that it is a suitable candidate for removal from the Green Belt. This provides further justification that the Site should be considered positively as a housing allocation within the Site Allocations Plan.

Consideration of Other Sites

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3064

Housing

Greystone Farm/Bungalow, Wakefield Road, Drighlington

Name: Liongate Developments Ltd

Representor No: PRS03010

The Issues and Options draft of the Site Allocations Plan contains a number of questions regarding the classification of the identified housing sites. We answer these below and in doing so assess some of the other potential housing sites within the Outer South West area. *see pdf of representaiton for table*Our analysis shows that when many of those sites that are also classified as amber within the Site

Allocations Plan document are assessed, their associated constraints demonstrate that they are less preferable and less sustainable than our client's site and so should be reclassified as unsuitable (red) sites.

In contrast to this our client's site would make a sustainable contribution to housing land within the Outer South West area of Leeds and the constraints identified can be readily addressed.

Summary and Conclusions

These representations have been submitted in relation to our client's land off Birchfield Avenue, Gildersome. The site has been given the reference of 3064 site and has been classified as an amber site within the draft Site Allocations Plan. This means that although the site could come forward as a residential allocation, there are constraints relating to it. The constraints identified are its current Green Belt designation and potential access issues.

The emerging Core Strategy identifies that Leeds needs to provide 66,000 new dwellings over the plan period and that the Outer South West area (containing Gildersome) is proposed to deliver 7,200 of these. There are currently 1,614 dwellings to be built from existing planning permissions and allocations which leaves a residual target of 5,586 dwellings. The dark green sites within the Outer , South West area provide a total yield of 4,154 units. Barton Willmore's previous representations to the Core Strategy outline our objections to these current housing levels (which we believe should be higher). Nevertheless even taking into account these current numbers, in order to meet its housing targets, the Council will need to consider additional sites.

It is against this background that we have examined our client's site and we have provided within this letter and attachments evidence to show the constraints associated with the Site can be overcome demonstrating that it is a suitable candidate for removal from the Green Belt and that a safe and adequate access can be provided. Taking this into account as well as the overall sustainability credentials of the Site when assessed against the policies of the NPPF, the Site should be favourably considered as a residential allocation.

For completeness we have also examined other sites within the Outer South West area that are being considered for residential allocations. Many of these sites do not provide the advantages that our client's site does in terms of their sustainability and some are unduly constrained. These sites are therefore not as preferable as future residential allocations.

See representation for Appendices on highway site appraisal

Name: Richard Marshall

Representor No: PRS03170

Representation ID: REP01024 Question Ref: H4

2098C, 2105, 2155, 3000, 3056,3064, 3078A, 4004, and 4029. As previously stated the amber sites that are greenbelt land should not be considered for development.

Representation ID: REP01024 Question Ref: H5

1079, 1072, 1077, 1143B, 1143D, 1171B, 1200A, 1258, 1284a, 1285, 1344, 2098a, 3365, 3456A.2098C, 2105, 2155, 3000, 3056,3064, 3078A, 4004, and 4029. As previously stated the amber sites that are greenbelt land should not be considered for development. Site 1032 is designated as a protected area of search this land has been retained along the edge of the existing settlement pending more suitable sites being found in the longer term this site should only be developed as a last resort.

Name: Paul Crowther

Representor No: PRS05072

Representation ID: REP05633 Question Ref: H4

3064 & 3000 provide an infill area which can be developed with little impact on the green belt. We own two sections of land within 3064 and there is a large area of frontage onto Bradford Road which will allow access into sites 3064 & 3000. I believe these should be removed from the greenbelt and allocated residential status.

Name: Gemma Wood

Representor No: PRS05077

Representation ID: REP05644 Question Ref: H4

Yes. It joins two settlements together (Gildersome and Drighlington). It has no defensible boundaries. Has drainage problems?, sewer connections

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3064

Housing

Greystone Farm/Bungalow, Wakefield Road, Drighlington

Name: John Hall

Representor No: PRS05163

Representation ID: REP07384 Question Ref: H4

Site 3000 and Site 3064 Gildersome (see separate appendices in saved pdfs)

1.Introduction

1.1.These reports have been produced in response to Leeds City Councils consultation with regard to the Leeds site allocations plan and in particular to the housing site 3000, Land to the rear of 1-24 Street Lane, Gildersome.

1.2.The reasoning behind this representation is two fold. Firstly, to suggest the creation of a new allocation revising the boundaries suggested by the allocations document to a more logical housing site (see fig 4 in the appendix) and secondly to confirm the ability of both the new site and the original site 3000 to address issues of highways access to the site which is identified within the site allocations document as the reason behind why site 3000 is colour coded amber and not green.

2.Site and Surroundings

2.1 The potential development site is located on land to the rear of 1-24A Street Lane, Gildersome, approximately 800m south of the village centre, and 900m east of the neighbouring village of Drighlington. The site is also located 2.4km west of Morley Town Centre, and 7.5km southwest of Leeds City Centre. The site has been identified as an 'Amber' site by Leeds City Council and is located within the Outer South West Area that encompasses Morley, East and West Ardsley, Beeston, Belle Isle, Drighlington, Gildersome, and Middleton. The majority of the site is made up of Site Ref 3000, and part of the neighbouring site (Site Ref 3064).

2.2 The site is largely a greenfield site used for agricultural purposes. However, to the south side there are 3 industrial starter units, that can be reached using the existing access off Bradford Road. The site access is also used to reach the adjacent electricity substation. The site including the access totals some 2.31 Hectares, using the whole 1.2 Hectares of Site Ref 3000, and 1.11 of Site Ref 3064. The site is bounded by Gildersome Sports and Cricket Club to the north, the remaining section of Site Ref 3064 and a plant hire depot to the west, the residential properties of 1 to 24A Street Lane to the east, and the residential properties off Bradford Road and the electricity substation to the south.

3.The creation of a new site allocation.

3.1 The two site allocations (site 3000 and 3064) have been reviewed to see if a more logical site can be formed that would sit more comfortably within all the planning considerations that form the decision making process within this site allocation process. The resulting revised site can be seen on the accompanying plan (Drawing No: 13054/03). This plan shows an indicative layout that shows how the site could work for illustrative purposes only. Additionally, part of the site to the front which is understood formed part of the SHLAA site 3004 is included to possibly assist with the site access, should this be deemed necessary.

3.2. The creation of this site means that it is within the ownership of two individuals and is readily available should it be allocated as an housing site.

3.3. The revised site is located within the Green Belt and as such, this revised site is now suggested as it provides the best possible site available when assessed against the Green Belt methodology.

3.4 The revised site has physical boundaries to all sides. To the North of the site is a protected playing pitch in the form of Gildersome Sports and Cricket club. This club forms the whole of the Northern boundary and this would prevent further sprawl in a Northward direction (see fig 1 and 2 appendix). The Eastern boundary is formed by housing, again along its entire length (see fig 3 appendix). This also forms the Green Belt boundary as does the Southern boundary, which has an electrical substation and a house with Bradford Road beyond. Finally, the Western boundary is formed by a commercial premises, along two thirds its length, consisting of large buildings and open working areas (see fig 4 appendix). This site also forms the remaining part of site allocation 3064 and if this were to be confirmed as a housing allocation, the revised site proposed here would be totally enclosed by physical development. As it is now, only the Northern part of the Western boundary would form a connection with the more open aspect of the Green Belt beyond and the site would be almost totally enclosed within physical barriers that would prevent further encroachment into the Green Belt.

3.5. As a result, it is considered that in terms of locating housing development within the Green Belt, this revised site would form one of the most acceptable sites within the whole site allocations document due to its enclosed nature and strong physical barriers.

4.Highway access.

4.1 The main issue raised within the site allocations document against site 3000 and 3064 was one of highways and in particular access to the site. This has been dealt with through the accompanying highways report. This demonstrates that access to both site 3000 or the proposed revised site can successfully be achieved to overcome these concerns and that this should not inhibit the site from being included as a Green coded housing allocation.

5.Summary.

5.1 The site is located within the Green Belt as are a large number of the sites proposed within the site allocations document. It appears to be generally accepted that to achieve the numbers of houses that the targets require, it will be inevitable that sites will be required that are located within the Green Belt. It is therefore necessary to find the best sites that have the least impact on the aims of the Green Belt and as described above, the site is considered to be as good as could be found, given its enclosed siting with strong physical boundaries that would prevent further sprawl into the Green Belt.

5.2. Confirmation of the acceptability of the site in highways terms with a good vehicular access as well as excellent multiple pedestrian links suggest that the site is ideally suited to housing development and that its sustainable nature shown within the highways report is further confirmed by the recent approval of a 26 house development (subject to the signing of a section 106 agreement) approximately 200 metres away on the Southern side of Bradford Road.

5.3 As a result, it is considered that the site currently considered as amber in the colour coding system of the site allocations document, should be coded green as it provides a sustainable, accessible site that fulfils best the Green Belt criteria for such sites. It is readily available and whilst obviously within the Green Belt, and therefore not as desirable as brownfield sites in terms of order of delivery, it should still be given a short term delivery phasing due to its availability and its standing as one of the very best Green Belt sites available.

5.4. It is therefore requested that this new site boundary be considered as the preferential manner of dealing with this housing allocation site bringing the most overall benefits and that the site be colour coded green and allocated a short term delivery phasing.

5.5 If this new site is not considered acceptable, then site 3000, using SHLAA site 3004 for access purposes, be considered suitable for housing allocation and that this be colour coded green and allocated a short term delivery phasing

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3064

Housing

Greystone Farm/Bungalow, Wakefield Road, Drighlington

Name: John Hall

Representor No: PRS05163

Representation ID: REP05742 Question Ref: H4

Site Allocations representation for sites 3000 and 3064 of the Outer South West area

Site Allocations representation for sites 3000 and 3064 of the Outer South West area

1.Introduction

1.1.These reports have been produced in response to Leeds City Councils consultation with regard to the Leeds site allocations plan and in particular to the housing site 3000, Land to the rear of 1-24 Street Lane, Gildersome.

1.2.The reasoning behind this representation is two fold. Firstly, to suggest the creation of a new allocation revising the boundaries suggested by the allocations document to a more logical housing site (see fig 4 in the appendix) and secondly to confirm the ability of both the new site and the original site 3000 to address issues of highways access to the site which is identified within the site allocations document as the reason behind why site 3000 is colour coded amber and not green.

2.Site and Surroundings

2.1 The potential development site is located on land to the rear of 1-24A Street Lane, Gildersome, approximately 800m south of the village centre, and 900m east of the neighbouring village of Drighlington. The site is also located 2.4km west of Morley Town Centre, and 7.5km southwest of Leeds City Centre. The site has been identified as an 'Amber' site by Leeds City Council and is located within the Outer South West Area that encompasses Morley, East and West Ardsley, Beeston, Belle Isle, Drighlington, Gildersome, and Middleton. The majority of the site is made up of Site Ref 3000, and part of the neighbouring site (Site Ref 3064).

2.2 The site is largely a greenfield site used for agricultural purposes. However, to the south side there are 3 industrial starter units, that can be reached using the existing access off Bradford Road. The site access is also used to reach the adjacent electricity substation. The site including the access totals some 2.31 Hectares, using the whole 1.2 Hectares of Site Ref 3000, and 1.11 of Site Ref 3064. The site is bounded by Gildersome Sports and Cricket Club to the north, the remaining section of Site Ref 3064 and a plant hire depot to the west, the residential properties of 1 to 24A Street Lane to the east, and the residential properties off Bradford Road and the electricity substation to the south.

3.The creation of a new site allocation.

3.1 The two site allocations (site 3000 and 3064) have been reviewed to see if a more logical site can be formed that would sit more comfortably within all the planning considerations that form the decision making process within this site allocation process. The resulting revised site can be seen on the accompanying plan (Drawing No: 13054/03). This plan shows an indicative layout that shows how the site could work for illustrative purposes only. Additionally, part of the site to the front which is understood formed part of the SHLAA site 3004 is included to possibly assist with the site access, should this be deemed necessary.

3.2. The creation of this site means that it is within the ownership of two individuals and is readily available should it be allocated as an housing site.

3.3. The revised site is located within the Green Belt and as such, this revised site is now suggested as it provides the best possible site available when assessed against the Green Belt methodology.

3.4 The revised site has physical boundaries to all sides. To the North of the site is a protected playing pitch in the form of Gildersome Sports and Cricket club. This club forms the whole of the Northern boundary and this would prevent further sprawl in a Northward direction (see fig 1 and 2 appendix). The Eastern boundary is formed by housing, again along its entire length (see fig 3 appendix). This also forms the Green Belt boundary as does the Southern boundary, which has an electrical substation and a house with Bradford Road beyond. Finally, the Western boundary is formed by a commercial premises, along two thirds its length, consisting of large buildings and open working areas (see fig 4 appendix). This site also forms the remaining part of site allocation 3064 and if this were to be confirmed as a housing allocation, the revised site proposed here would be totally enclosed by physical development. As it is now, only the Northern part of the Western boundary would form a connection with the more open aspect of the Green Belt beyond and the site would be almost totally enclosed within physical barriers that would prevent further encroachment into the Green Belt.

3.5. As a result, it is considered that in terms of locating housing development within the Green Belt, this revised site would form one of the most acceptable sites within the whole site allocations document due to its enclosed nature and strong physical barriers.

4.Highway access.

4.1 The main issue raised within the site allocations document against site 3000 and 3064 was one of highways and in particular access to the site. This has been dealt with through the accompanying highways report. This demonstrates that access to both site 3000 or the proposed revised site can successfully be achieved to overcome these concerns and that this should not inhibit the site form being included as a Green coded housing allocation.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3064

Housing

Greystone Farm/Bungalow, Wakefield Road, Drighlington

Name: John Hall

Representor No: PRS05163

5.Summary.

5.1 The site is located within the Green Belt as are a large number of the sites proposed within the site allocations document. It appears to be generally accepted that to achieve the numbers of houses that the targets require, it will be inevitable that sites will be required that are located within the Green Belt. It is therefore necessary to find the best sites that have the least impact on the aims of the Green Belt and as described above, the site is considered to be as good as could be found, given its enclosed siting with strong physical boundaries that would prevent further sprawl into the Green Belt.

5.2. Confirmation of the acceptability of the site in highways terms with a good vehicular access as well as excellent multiple pedestrian links suggest that the site is ideally suited to housing development and that its sustainable nature shown within the highways report is further confirmed by the recent approval of a 26 house development (subject to the signing of a section 106 agreement) approximately 200 metres away on the Southern side of Bradford Road.

5.3 As a result, it is considered that the site currently considered as amber in the colour coding system of the site allocations document, should be coded green as it provides a sustainable, accessible site that fulfils best the Green Belt criteria for such sites. It is readily available and whilst obviously within the Green Belt, and therefore not as desirable as brownfield sites in terms of order of delivery, it should still be given a short term delivery phasing due to its availability and its standing as one of the very best Green Belt sites available.

5.4. It is therefore requested that this new site boundary be considered as the preferential manner of dealing with this housing allocation site bringing the most overall benefits and that the site be colour coded green and allocated a short term delivery phasing.

5.5 If this new site is not considered acceptable, then site 3000, using SHLAA site 3004 for access purposes, be considered suitable for housing allocation and that this be colour coded green and allocated a short term delivery phasing

1.Introduction

1.1.These reports have been produced in response to Leeds City Councils consultation with regard to the Leeds site allocations plan and in particular to the housing site 3000, Land to the rear of 1-24 Street Lane, Gildersome.

1.2.The reasoning behind this representation is two fold. Firstly, to suggest the creation of a new allocation revising the boundaries suggested by the allocations document to a more logical housing site (see fig 4 in the appendix) and secondly to confirm the ability of both the new site and the original site 3000 to address issues of highways access to the site which is identified within the site allocations document as the reason behind why site 3000 is colour coded amber and not green.

2.Site and Surroundings

2.1 The potential development site is located on land to the rear of 1-24A Street Lane, Gildersome, approximately 800m south of the village centre, and 900m east of the neighbouring village of Drighlington. The site is also located 2.4km west of Morley Town Centre, and 7.5km southwest of Leeds City Centre. The site has been identified as an 'Amber' site by Leeds City Council and is located within the Outer South West Area that encompasses Morley, East and West Ardsley, Beeston, Belle Isle, Drighlington, Gildersome, and Middleton. The majority of the site is made up of Site Ref 3000, and part of the neighbouring site (Site Ref 3064).

2.2 The site is largely a greenfield site used for agricultural purposes. However, to the south side there are 3 industrial starter units, that can be reached using the existing access off Bradford Road. The site access is also used to reach the adjacent electricity substation. The site including the access totals some 2.31 Hectares, using the whole 1.2 Hectares of Site Ref 3000, and 1.11 of Site Ref 3064. The site is bounded by Gildersome Sports and Cricket Club to the north, the remaining section of Site Ref 3064 and a plant hire depot to the west, the residential properties of 1 to 24A Street Lane to the east, and the residential properties off Bradford Road and the electricity substation to the south.

3.The creation of a new site allocation.

3.1 The two site allocations (site 3000 and 3064) have been reviewed to see if a more logical site can be formed that would sit more comfortably within all the planning considerations that form the decision making process within this site allocation process. The resulting revised site can be seen on the accompanying plan (Drawing No: 13054/03). This plan shows an indicative layout that shows how the site could work for illustrative purposes only. Additionally, part of the site to the front which is understood formed part of the SHLAA site 3004 is included to possibly assist with the site access, should this be deemed necessary.

3.2. The creation of this site means that it is within the ownership of two individuals and is readily available should it be allocated as an housing site.

3.3. The revised site is located within the Green Belt and as such, this revised site is now suggested as it provides the best possible site available when assessed against the Green Belt methodology.

3.4 The revised site has physical boundaries to all sides. To the North of the site is a protected playing pitch in the form of Gildersome Sports and Cricket club. This club forms the whole of the Northern boundary and this would prevent further sprawl in a Northward direction (see fig 1 and 2 appendix). The Eastern boundary is formed by housing, again along its entire length (see fig 3 appendix). This also forms the Green Belt boundary as does the Southern boundary, which has an electrical substation and a house with Bradford Road beyond. Finally, the Western boundary is formed by a commercial premises, along two thirds its length, consisting of large buildings and open working areas (see fig 4 appendix). This site also forms the remaining part of site allocation 3064 and if this were to be confirmed as a housing allocation, the revised site proposed here would be totally enclosed by physical development. As it is now, only the Northern part of the Western boundary would form a connection with the more open aspect of the Green Belt beyond and the site would be almost totally enclosed within physical barriers that would prevent further encroachment into the Green Belt.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3064

Housing

Greystone Farm/Bungalow, Wakefield Road, Drighlington

Name: John Hall

Representor No: PRS05163

3.5. As a result, it is considered that in terms of locating housing development within the Green Belt, this revised site would form one of the most acceptable sites within the whole site allocations document due to its enclosed nature and strong physical barriers.

4.Highway access.

4.1 The main issue raised within the site allocations document against site 3000 and 3064 was one of highways and in particular access to the site. This has been dealt with through the accompanying highways report. This demonstrates that access to both site 3000 or the proposed revised site can successfully be achieved to overcome these concerns and that this should not inhibit the site from being included as a Green coded housing allocation.

5.Summary.

5.1 The site is located within the Green Belt as are a large number of the sites proposed within the site allocations document. It appears to be generally accepted that to achieve the numbers of houses that the targets require, it will be inevitable that sites will be required that are located within the Green Belt. It is therefore necessary to find the best sites that have the least impact on the aims of the Green Belt and as described above, the site is considered to be as good as could be found, given its enclosed siting with strong physical boundaries that would prevent further sprawl into the Green Belt.

5.2. Confirmation of the acceptability of the site in highways terms with a good vehicular access as well as excellent multiple pedestrian links suggest that the site is ideally suited to housing development and that its sustainable nature shown within the highways report is further confirmed by the recent approval of a 26 house development (subject to the signing of a section 106 agreement) approximately 200 metres away on the Southern side of Bradford Road.

5.3 As a result, it is considered that the site currently considered as amber in the colour coding system of the site allocations document, should be coded green as it provides a sustainable, accessible site that fulfils best the Green Belt criteria for such sites. It is readily available and whilst obviously within the Green Belt, and therefore not as desirable as brownfield sites in terms of order of delivery, it should still be given a short term delivery phasing due to its availability and its standing as one of the very best Green Belt sites available.

5.4. It is therefore requested that this new site boundary be considered as the preferential manner of dealing with this housing allocation site bringing the most overall benefits and that the site be colour coded green and allocated a short term delivery phasing.

5.5 If this new site is not considered acceptable, then site 3000, using SHLAA site 3004 for access purposes, be considered suitable for housing allocation and that this be colour coded green and allocated a short term delivery phasing

Name: Alan Hoare

Representor No: PRS05284

Representation ID: REP05878 Question Ref: H4

3064 Greystone Farm/Bungalow, Wakefield Road.Amber to Red. No Should be Red No defendable Boundary. Joins 2 settlements. Good wildlife area. Good open greenspace. Good walking along footpath.

Name: Abigail Doherty

Representor No: PRS05323

Representation ID: REP05914 Question Ref: H4

3064 Greystone Farm/Bungalow, Wakefield Road. Amber to Red Yes

No defendable boundary. Joins 2 settlements. A lot of wildlife good agricultural land used a lot by walkers along footpaths good open green space.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3064

Housing

Greystone Farm/Bungalow, Wakefield Road, Drighlington

Name: Jw Crowther & Son Ltd Jw Crowther & Son Ltd

Representor No: PRS05426

Representation ID: REP06017 Question Ref: H4

H5: Which Amber sites do you disagree with and why?

Our client owns land within site ref 3064 which is also adjacent to site ref 3000, which are identified as amber sites in the Issues and Options Draft Site Allocations Plan as a 'site which has potential but issues or not favoured as a green site' and considers that the land should be colour coded green as a site that is developable for housing.

NPPF Tests of soundness

Paragraph 182 states:

The Local Plan will be examined by an independent inspector whose role is to assess whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, legal and procedural requirements, and whether it is sound. A local planning authority should submit a plan for examination which it considers is "sound" – namely that it is:

Positively prepared, Justified, Effective and Consistent with national policy.

Justification

The sites are located to the north of Bradford Road, Gildersome. It is in the south of the village. Drighlington is located a short way to the west. The site is within the outer south-west of Leeds District in a highly sustainable location being close to the aforementioned villages with a decent range of services and amenities (schools, local shopping facilities and restaurants), but is easily accessible to Morley, a town that has a wide range of shops, services and amenities. The site is also just to the north of facilities at Birstall Retail Park which provides a range of shops and restaurants as well as a cinema. The site is well located in terms of the local highway network and is close to Junction 27 of the M62 and the M621.

The land can be accessed via existing access points to the north of Bradford Road, an adopted road which formerly constituted the through road from Morley through Drighlington. The road has been more recently stopped prior to the construction of the new Drighlington bypass and the roundabout/major junction at Gildersome spur. As such road traffic is now minimal within this short road length and services only a limited number of properties. However, the road is significantly wide in terms of individual carriageways and footpaths, but has separation between carriageways relating to its previous role in the road network. The road therefore is capable of handling a substantial volume of traffic and links into the wider network via the B135 and A650.

Our clients land is in single family ownership and is available for development in the short term.

The site is suitable for residential development as an infill development opportunity with built development on three sides and in a very urbanised area close to the Motorway network and significant retail park. The site is in a highly sustainable location within Gildersome, a large village that is well served by local services and facilities (2 Primary Schools, nurseries, a Co-operative foodstore, an indian restaurant, various eateries/takeaways, public houses, clubs, a library and community centre and a Sure Start Children's Centre). It is also close to Drighlington which has a similar range of facilities and amenities. It is very close to key bus routes with stops in easy walking distance to the east and the west. There are playing fields to the east and a cricket club to the north. Morley is close by which is a key town in the south of Leeds that is served by a substantial range of schools, shops, leisure, services and facilities. To the immediate south of the Motorway is the Birstall Retail Park.

The site is achievable as it is located in a highly sustainable location and is in single family ownership. The owners are willingly promoting the land for development. The site can come forward for development within 5 years and certainly can be developed during the Plan Period.

Proposed Change

The sites reference 3064 and 3000 should be identified within the Site Allocations plan as 'green' sites as having 'greatest potential to be allocated for housing'.

Representation ID: REP06017 Question Ref: H4

H5: Which Amber sites do you disagree with and why?

Our client owns land within site ref 3064 which is also adjacent to site ref 3000, which are identified as amber sites in the Issues and Options Draft Site Allocations Plan as a 'site which has potential but issues or not favoured as a green site' and considers that the land should be colour coded green as a site that is developable for housing.

NPPF Tests of soundness

Paragraph 182 states:

The Local Plan will be examined by an independent inspector whose role is to assess whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, legal and procedural requirements, and whether it is sound. A local planning authority should submit a plan for examination which it considers is "sound" – namely that it is:

Positively prepared, Justified, Effective and Consistent with national policy.

Justification

The sites are located to the north of Bradford Road, Gildersome. It is in the south of the village. Drighlington is located a short way to the west. The site is within the outer south-west of Leeds District in a highly sustainable location being close to the aforementioned villages with a decent range of services and amenities (schools, local shopping facilities and restaurants), but is easily accessible to Morley, a town that has a wide range of shops, services and amenities. The site is also just to the north of facilities at Birstall Retail Park which provides a range of shops and restaurants as well as a cinema. The site is well located in terms of the local highway network and is close to Junction 27 of the M62 and the M621.

The land can be accessed via existing access points to the north of Bradford Road, an adopted road which formerly constituted the through road from Morley through Drighlington. The road has been more recently stopped prior to the construction of the new Drighlington bypass and the roundabout/major junction at Gildersome spur. As such road traffic is now minimal within this short road length and services only a limited number of properties. However, the road is significantly wide in terms of individual carriageways and footpaths, but has separation between carriageways relating to its previous role in the road network. The road therefore is capable of handling a substantial volume of traffic and links into the wider network via the B135 and A650.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3064

Housing

Greystone Farm/Bungalow, Wakefield Road, Drighlington

Name: Neil Dawson
Representor No: PRS05884

Representation ID: REP06563 Question Ref: H4

Suggested sites from Amber to Red;

- 309
- 1067B
- 1069
- 1143F
- 1220A
- 1274
- 1275A
- 1279
- 1332
- 2105
- 2155
- 3000
- 3064
- 3078A
- 4004

These sites are almost all located within the existing Green Belt and expansion into the Green Belt would lead to increased urban sprawl between the various townships in the Outer South West, and lead to coalescence between communities

Development of the Green Belt sites would also reduce the open green area and provide encroachment into the countryside around Morley and other smaller townships.

In addition there is insufficient road capacity and little scope for expansion for other necessary services. There would be a requirement for new or upgrading of existing roads which would therefore favour development on sites that are already located within the Morley or the Leeds Urban areas rather than eroding the Green Belt further.

Site 3078A is close to potential development in Kirklees and could lead to the complete erosion of the Green Belt and open green space between Leeds and Kirklees.

Any further development at sites 1275A and 1279 would reduce the Green Belt between the existing residential boundary and the A653 Dewsbury Road to a narrow strip which would put pressure in future years to extend residential use further east.

See rep for full details.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3064

Housing

Greystone Farm/Bungalow, Wakefield Road, Drighlington

Name: Liongate Developments Limited

Representor No: PRS06410

Representation ID: REP07389 Question Ref: H4

Site 3064

We regard our client's site as a sustainable option for a future residential allocation on the basis that the Site is well related to the existing built-up area of Gildersome and is in a location that provides easy access to key local services including shops, banks and schools; many within Gildersome itself and others in nearby Morley. The Site is also located in an area with a good public transport service with a bus stop around 250m from the site with services to Leeds City Centre, Huddersfield, Morley, Dewsbury and Birstall (routes 209 and 219). As a result of this it is

considered that a housing allocation on the site would be consistent with paragraphs 17, 34, 47 and 52 of the NPPF (detailed above) and draft Spatial Policy 6 of the emerging Core Strategy.

Paragraph 7 of the NPPF identifies three specific but interrelated roles that need to be considered; these are economic, social and environmental. It is considered that in the case of our client's site that it could contribute to all three of these roles by:

- Contributing to building a strong economy by ensuring sufficient land is available for housing which can be utilised by the local workforce, now and in the future and that new residents can help sustain existing local businesses in the area;
- Being capable of delivering much needed housing within this area of Leeds and is capable of offering an appropriate mix of housing sizes and types and so can make a positive impact on social and well-being; and
- Being a relatively unconstrained Site that is capable of addressing any environmental issue that may be associated with its redevelopment.

Site Specific Considerations

The assessment of the Site within the Council's SHLAA, along with the accompanying analysis within the draft Site Allocation Plan generally considers the Site favourably as a future residential allocation. Nevertheless two constraints are noted and are the reason why the Site is currently classified as amber. These constraints are:

- The Site's access
- The Site's current Green Belt designation.

Site Access

To explore site access in more detail we instructed PAH Highway Consultants Ltd to analyse the Site and to assess its potential for providing a safe and acceptable access. Their assessment is appended to this letter as Annex 1 and concludes that a safe and adequate access arrangement can be achieved off Bradford Road to serve residential accommodation and in doing so addresses Paragraph 34 of the NPPF.

This demonstrates that a viable access on to the Site can be achieved and so should no longer be regarded as a constraint when considering it as a future residential allocation.

Green Belt

The Green Belt assessment covers the criteria outlined within paragraph 80 of the NPPF to ascertain each site's suitability for removal. Overall our client's site performs well when judged against the criteria; in particular the assessment notes that the Site:

- Is well connected to built-up area;
- Has a low potential for unrestricted sprawl;
- Will not result in the merging of two settlements; and
- Provides an opportunity to 'round-off' the settlement.

Nevertheless for completeness we have also undertaken our own Green Belt assessment of the site below using the Council's pro-forma contained in Appendix 1 of the Site Allocations Plan Issues and Options draft [see rep for full Green Belt assessment].

Our own assessment is consistent with the Council's and concludes that the Site should be favoured for removal from the Green Belt on the basis that it scores well against the above criteria.

Summary of Site Specific Analysis

Our own analysis of the site specific constraints identified show the Site is both capable of providing a sufficient access and that it is a suitable candidate for removal from the Green Belt. This provides further justification that the Site should be considered positively as a housing allocation within the Site Allocations Plan.

See rep for full details

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3064

Housing

Greystone Farm/Bungalow, Wakefield Road, Drighlington

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H4

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Amber Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are be minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H4

Disagree with Council's amber assessment, think the site should be red

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H4

Disagree with Council's amber assessment, think the site should be red

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3068

Housing

Valley Road, Morley

Name: Persimmon Homes

Representor No: PRS05691

Representation ID: REP06835 Question Ref: H7

Site 3068

Persimmon does not agree with the red assessment of the site.

The basis of the Council's red rating is the sites location within the Green Belt and concerns about its isolation and access requirements. In reality, this site will come forward as a comprehensive masterplan with Sites 1282 and 1283 and will be a later phase once the requisite access infrastructure has been put in place.

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.

The sprawl of Morley will be maintained by the railway line to the east. This is a defensible boundary and will, therefore, maintain separation between Morley and Middleton.

Prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another.

The merging of Morley and Middleton will be prevented by the railway line to the east. This is a defensible boundary and will, therefore, maintain separation between Morley and Middleton.

Safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Encroachment into the countryside will be restricted by the railway line.

Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

The land north of Valley Mills does not contribute to the setting and special character of a historic town.

Assist urban regeneration

Releasing this site from the Green Belt for housing will contribute to a demonstrable need for housing in Morley that cannot be met fully by existing sites not identified as Green Belt.

We recommend the Council:

- Clarifies how it has assessed the distance to the rail station and nearest bus stop.
- States that the site is available, suitable and achievable.
- States that the development of this site conforms with the Core Strategy and is major settlement extension, along with site ref: 1283.
- Provide further information on what has been used to rank the site.

See rep for full details

Representation ID: REP06835 Question Ref: H11

We consider that site 3068 is available immediately for development. Therefore we consider development can be achieved on the sites in the short term i.e. within 5 years and leading into the medium to longer term.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3068

Housing

Valley Road, Morley

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Mavis & Geoff Pell

Representor No: PRS00594

Representation ID: REP02553 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Amber to Red

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: G Storey

Representor No: PRS00595

Representation ID: REP02578 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Margaret Middleton

Representor No: PRS00600

Representation ID: REP02585 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: A Farrelly

Representor No: PRS00601

Representation ID: REP02587 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Carnell

Representor No: PRS00603

Representation ID: REP02588 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: D C Hartley

Representor No: PRS00604

Representation ID: REP02590 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Ryan Redmond

Representor No: PRS00633

Representation ID: REP02618 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: G Woodhead

Representor No: PRS00635

Representation ID: REP02620 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Robert Stephen Cheeseman

Representor No: PRS00636

Representation ID: REP02622 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Featherstone

Representor No: PRS00638

Representation ID: REP02623 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: J Payne

Representor No: PRS00639

Representation ID: REP02624 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: V Smith

Representor No: PRS00641

Representation ID: REP02625 Question Ref: H7

3069 Weide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: M Thompson

Representor No: PRS00647

Representation ID: REP02628 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Robina O'Neill

Representor No: PRS00649

Representation ID: REP02633 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Roy Johnson

Representor No: PRS00650

Representation ID: REP02634 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Tom Rodi

Representor No: PRS00651

Representation ID: REP02635 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Natasha Dickenson

Representor No: PRS00653

Representation ID: REP02638 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Charlotte Robson

Representor No: PRS00654

Representation ID: REP02640 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Stephen Dixon

Representor No: PRS00658

Representation ID: REP02646 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: L Kilpatrick

Representor No: PRS00659

Representation ID: REP02647 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Julie Shaw

Representor No: PRS00660

Representation ID: REP02648 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Laura Pickup

Representor No: PRS00661

Representation ID: REP02649 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: E Megson

Representor No: PRS00662

Representation ID: REP02651 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: J Hanson

Representor No: PRS00663

Representation ID: REP02652 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: C H Knight

Representor No: PRS00664

Representation ID: REP02653 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Graham Cowell

Representor No: PRS00665

Representation ID: REP02654 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Paul King

Representor No: PRS00666

Representation ID: REP02655 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Gillian Welborn

Representor No: PRS00667

Representation ID: REP02658 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Vettraino Frank

Representor No: PRS00670

Representation ID: REP02662 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Sharon Calvert

Representor No: PRS00672

Representation ID: REP02663 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Madison Nice

Representor No: PRS00673

Representation ID: REP02665 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Elaine Payne

Representor No: PRS00674

Representation ID: REP02667 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Tracy Stanley

Representor No: PRS00676

Representation ID: REP02668 Question Ref: H7

3069 - Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Sarah Garfield

Representor No: PRS00678

Representation ID: REP02670 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Sharon Wilson

Representor No: PRS00681

Representation ID: REP02674 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Mandi Marchant

Representor No: PRS00684

Representation ID: REP02677 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Susan Bethell

Representor No: PRS00686

Representation ID: REP02679 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Susan Kellett

Representor No: PRS00687

Representation ID: REP02681 Question Ref: H7

3069 - Wide Lane Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Natalie Bentham

Representor No: PRS00689

Representation ID: REP02684 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: P Sams

Representor No: PRS00691

Representation ID: REP02686 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Ian Mortimer

Representor No: PRS00692

Representation ID: REP02687 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Lynne Jones

Representor No: PRS00694

Representation ID: REP02688 Question Ref: H7

3690 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Janet Ayres

Representor No: PRS00695

Representation ID: REP02689 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: James Thomas

Representor No: PRS00700

Representation ID: REP02701 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: S Bedford

Representor No: PRS00702

Representation ID: REP02702 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: C Kurij

Representor No: PRS00703

Representation ID: REP02704 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Rita & Simon Rumsey

Representor No: PRS00705

Representation ID: REP02705 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Stott Lisa

Representor No: PRS00708

Representation ID: REP02707 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Vicky Richardson

Representor No: PRS00710

Representation ID: REP02710 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: K King

Representor No: PRS00712

Representation ID: REP02712 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Sarah Turpin

Representor No: PRS00720

Representation ID: REP02723 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Name: Zac Hewson

Representor No: PRS00722

Representation ID: REP02725 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Mark Sizer

Representor No: PRS00723

Representation ID: REP02726 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Rachel Dunning

Representor No: PRS00724

Representation ID: REP02728 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Geoffrey Wilkinson

Representor No: PRS00725

Representation ID: REP02729 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: S Elliott

Representor No: PRS00726

Representation ID: REP02730 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Nicola Armitage

Representor No: PRS00727

Representation ID: REP02732 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Jack Cooper

Representor No: PRS00729

Representation ID: REP02734 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: P Perkins

Representor No: PRS00730

Representation ID: REP02735 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: M Potts

Representor No: PRS00731

Representation ID: REP02736 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Sally Smith

Representor No: PRS00748

Representation ID: REP02755 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: B C Mosby

Representor No: PRS00749

Representation ID: REP02757 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Gwen Lovett

Representor No: PRS00750

Representation ID: REP02759 Question Ref: H7

3069 - Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: C Calvert

Representor No: PRS00752

Representation ID: REP02760 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Julie Ruan

Representor No: PRS00753

Representation ID: REP02762 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Susan Jackson

Representor No: PRS00755

Representation ID: REP02764 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Charlotte Harrison

Representor No: PRS00758

Representation ID: REP02766 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Marian Banica

Representor No: PRS00762

Representation ID: REP02771 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: D Durnell

Representor No: PRS00763

Representation ID: REP02775 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Alan Benn

Representor No: PRS00766

Representation ID: REP02777 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Sue Dalby

Representor No: PRS00769

Representation ID: REP02781 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Angela Mccarthy

Representor No: PRS00772

Representation ID: REP02782 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Avril Corker

Representor No: PRS00774

Representation ID: REP02784 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Maureen Rosindale

Representor No: PRS00776

Representation ID: REP02787 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Lorraine Best

Representor No: PRS00777

Representation ID: REP02788 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: S Ashworth

Representor No: PRS00788

Representation ID: REP02799 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Mandy Lyman

Representor No: PRS00789

Representation ID: REP02801 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Annabelle Beevers

Representor No: PRS00791

Representation ID: REP02964 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Representation ID: REP02802 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Geoffrey Pell

Representor No: PRS00793

Representation ID: REP02803 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Janet King

Representor No: PRS00794

Representation ID: REP02805 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: P Ambler

Representor No: PRS00797

Representation ID: REP02806 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: M Wilson

Representor No: PRS00799

Representation ID: REP02809 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Barbara Hinsliff

Representor No: PRS00801

Representation ID: REP02813 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Brenda Haigh

Representor No: PRS00803

Representation ID: REP02815 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Thomas O'Neill

Representor No: PRS00805

Representation ID: REP02817 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Barrie C Short

Representor No: PRS00812

Representation ID: REP02824 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Melville Hopwood

Representor No: PRS00819

Representation ID: REP02832 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Steven Ivankiv

Representor No: PRS00822

Representation ID: REP02836 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: J Holliday

Representor No: PRS00823

Representation ID: REP02837 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Peter Matthews

Representor No: PRS00824

Representation ID: REP02839 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Susan Richards

Representor No: PRS00825

Representation ID: REP02840 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Sarah Rimmer

Representor No: PRS00826

Representation ID: REP02841 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Davan Moore

Representor No: PRS00827

Representation ID: REP02842 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: A Ivankiv

Representor No: PRS00828

Representation ID: REP02843 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Beryl Pearce

Representor No: PRS00833

Representation ID: REP02848 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: M Stanley

Representor No: PRS00834

Representation ID: REP02849 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Jean Garforth

Representor No: PRS00835

Representation ID: REP02850 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Janet Wainwright

Representor No: PRS00836

Representation ID: REP02851 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Steve Wynn

Representor No: PRS00838

Representation ID: REP02853 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Amber to Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Joseph Bray

Representor No: PRS00839

Representation ID: REP02854 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: K Ramsden

Representor No: PRS00840

Representation ID: REP02855 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Greenwood

Representor No: PRS00917

Representation ID: REP02946 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Mavis Scott

Representor No: PRS00918

Representation ID: REP02947 Question Ref: H7

3069 Wide Lane - Red

Infrastructure not capable of supporting expansion

Traffic

The volume of traffic using Wide Lane is extremely high. The council has installed two central islands and speed bumps adjacent to the entrance/exit of the Topcliffe estate to provide some means for the pedestrians to cross this 'river of death', I was going to say 'safely', however that is not the case since no definite break in traffic is provided. Presumably traffic lights are too expensive?

When driving, trying to exit the Topcliffe estate and enter the traffic flow can be quite a time consuming exercise, especially turning right during peak traffic times.

This again is the current situation not post development!

Wide Lane meets Dewsbury Lane, again an inordinately busy dual carriageway. Since the opening of the White Rose Centre the volume of traffic along this highway has increased massively and at peak times along with weekend shopping traffic this road cannot cope with extra traffic volumes and additional housing development will again exacerbate this situation.

Infrastructure

Medical services in the Morley area are already overstretched. Dental practices have no vacancies for additional patients. I know of people who have to attend practices at the other side of Leeds because of the local situation.

Doctors surgeries are close to the same situation with waiting times for an appointment spiralling.

Public transport (which for the area under consideration means bus service) is suffering along with all other road users from the increased volume of traffic and the condition of the road surfaces in this and the surrounding areas.

Roads are literally crumbling under the massive volume of traffic and there seems no coordinated scheme in place to effect repairs.

If the LDF is put in place by Leeds City Council, Morley will be as large as Harrogate but whereas Harrogate has its own hospital and full time fire service, Morley has neither.

Schools

It has already been stated in the local media that Morley secondary schools will be at 'full capacity' by 2016 and that does not take into account any new housing development in the area. Newlands Primary School is being rebuilt and expanded but again, the additional 250 places will only accommodate children already in the system.

Parking

The official estimate that every house will have 0.6 cars is farcical, most cars on modern estates have 2 to 3 cars and parking these additional cars is becoming a severe problem resulting in congested streets within the estates.

The Topcliffe estate off wide lane is a perfect example of this problem and householders there have been warned by the fire service that in the event of a fire lives could be at risk because of cars parked on both sides of the streets limiting access for the fire engines.

Surely the planners must know that the horse goes 'in front of the cart' and realise that the infrastructure of the area should be put in place to give a workable system before additional population expansion to avoid catastrophic overcrowding and misplacements which will only serve to worsen our already cramped living standards.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Persimmon Homes

Representor No: PRS05691

Representation ID: REP06938 Question Ref: H7

We consider that site ref: 3069 should be identified as "Green Sites".

Representation ID: REP07054 Question Ref: H7

Site 3069

Firstly, we consider that the name used by the Council in its assessment is misleading. The White Rose Pub is located to the north of Wide Lane and is not, incidentally, considered as a potential future housing site. As such, we respectfully request that site ref: 3069 is renamed to "Owlers Farm Extension".

We do not agree with the red site classification. The site forms a logical extension to the Owlers Farm sites providing much needed housing capacity in a comprehensive and joined-up manner which will have minimal impact on existing residential area. While we agree with the assessment that development of this site in isolation could represent an isolated development, the fact that it is controlled by Persimmon (who also have controlling interests in adjoining sites), means that a comprehensive approach to delivery of this site is wholly achievable.

The site assessment shows that it is in an accessible location. It therefore appears that the site is classified as red due to its extant Green Belt allocation.

We do not consider this to be a robust reason for the "red site" classification of the site as the emerging Core Strategy sets out a commitment to review Green Belt Boundaries in order to accommodate the proposed level of housing growth.

Green Belt Assessment

Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas

We do not agree that development of the site would represent isolated development. It is entirely logical and appropriate that site 3069 be brought forward in conjunction with sites 1279 and 1285. Site 3069 is well contained with established boundaries set by permanent physical infrastructure. This provides for definition, defensible and logical boundaries.

To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

Persimmon Homes objects that the grade of the site is 1, 2 or 3a agricultural land value. We therefore request that the Council provides further information on how it has reached this conclusion. See our comments above as to how the site is well contained.

Coalescence / Conclusion

We agree that development of the site will not lead to coalescence of settlements and that the site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

The Green Belt assessment is incorrect in that it does not represent isolated development. The site does not fulfil Green Belt purposes and development of it will not result in the coalescence of settlements. The site is well contained and bordered by well established physical boundaries. In terms of accessibility, the site is well served by public transport and is located within a reasonable walking distance of bus stops on Wide Lane.

We would recommend that the Council:

- ☐ Clarifies how it has assessed the distance to the rail station and bus stop.
- ☐ States that the site is available, suitable and achievable.
- ☐ States that the development of this site conforms with the Core Strategy and is a major settlement greenfield extension.
- ☐ Provides further information on the agricultural land classification assumption..
- ☐ Provides further information on what information it has used to rank the site.

See rep for full details

Representation ID: REP07054 Question Ref: H11

Sites 1279 and 3069 are available immediately for development. We consider that development can be achieved on the sites in the short term i.e. within 5 years and leading into the medium to longer term.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3069

Housing

Wide Lane/Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network. From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3075

Housing

Whiteways, Thorpe Lane, Middleton

Name: Brian Guy

Representor No: PRS00142

Representation ID: REP04659 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: Wenda P Whitehead

Representor No: PRS00312

Representation ID: REP04786 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: Janice Beever

Representor No: PRS00441

Representation ID: REP04791 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: P S Barrie

Representor No: PRS00915

Representation ID: REP04810 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Representation ID: REP04781 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Representation ID: REP04769 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: Lynne Paul

Representor No: PRS01169

Representation ID: REP04800 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: D Paul

Representor No: PRS01183

Representation ID: REP04793 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: B Stringer

Representor No: PRS01606

Representation ID: REP04797 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3075

Housing

Whiteways, Thorpe Lane, Middleton

Name: L.e Beever

Representor No: PRS01607

Representation ID: REP04804 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: J Cowie

Representor No: PRS02227

Representation ID: REP04768 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: Susan Holt

Representor No: PRS02289

Representation ID: REP04772 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: Dereck Holt

Representor No: PRS02311

Representation ID: REP04766 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: Jenni Davenport

Representor No: PRS02330

Representation ID: REP04770 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: Frank Raven

Representor No: PRS02339

Representation ID: REP04771 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: E Naylor

Representor No: PRS02363

Representation ID: REP04780 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: Kathleen Paver

Representor No: PRS02372

Representation ID: REP04774 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3075

Housing

Whiteways, Thorpe Lane, Middleton

Name: C Guy

Representor No: PRS02377

Representation ID: REP04767 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: C Clegg

Representor No: PRS02406

Representation ID: REP04663 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: Doreen Gill

Representor No: PRS02496

Representation ID: REP04755 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: D Naylor

Representor No: PRS02497

Representation ID: REP04773 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: A Paver

Representor No: PRS02498

Representation ID: REP04775 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: James Bowers

Representor No: PRS02500

Representation ID: REP04777 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: Alan Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02501

Representation ID: REP04778 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: Vivienne Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02502

Representation ID: REP04779 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3075

Housing

Whiteways, Thorpe Lane, Middleton

Name: Vivian Oxtoby

Representor No: PRS02504

Representation ID: REP04783 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: Beryl Hewitt

Representor No: PRS02506

Representation ID: REP04785 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: D A Clegg

Representor No: PRS02507

Representation ID: REP04788 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: Pauline Wood

Representor No: PRS02508

Representation ID: REP04790 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: Joyce Thompson

Representor No: PRS02510

Representation ID: REP04792 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: Patricia Aston

Representor No: PRS02513

Representation ID: REP04796 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: L. G Wilson

Representor No: PRS02515

Representation ID: REP04799 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: S Laurence

Representor No: PRS02517

Representation ID: REP04801 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3075

Housing

Whiteways, Thorpe Lane, Middleton

Name: C Graham

Representor No: PRS02518

Representation ID: REP04803 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: M Allsop

Representor No: PRS02520

Representation ID: REP04805 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: R Hartill

Representor No: PRS02521

Representation ID: REP04806 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: Edith Holmes

Representor No: PRS02522

Representation ID: REP04808 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: Harry Holmes

Representor No: PRS02524

Representation ID: REP04811 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: Ann Morse

Representor No: PRS02526

Representation ID: REP04813 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: L.r Morse

Representor No: PRS02527

Representation ID: REP04816 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: Michael Hartill

Representor No: PRS02556

Representation ID: REP04847 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3075

Housing

Whiteways, Thorpe Lane, Middleton

Name: Jim Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02561

Representation ID: REP04852 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: Helen Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02562

Representation ID: REP04855 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: Ronald Gill

Representor No: PRS02564

Representation ID: REP04858 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: A.w Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02565

Representation ID: REP04859 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: J Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02566

Representation ID: REP04860 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: Norman Dearden

Representor No: PRS02568

Representation ID: REP04857 Question Ref: H12

Site ref 3075 could be considered. There have been Traveller or Gypsy families living in the area previously and this site would meet most of the requirements for such sites.

Name: Mark Brennan

Representor No: PRS03782

Representation ID: REP01655 Question Ref: H1

With numerous disused brownfield sites within the "outer south west" area it seems unbelievable that consideration is being given to the development of greenfield sites. The reason given by Leeds City Council that the brownfield sites are not to be developed is that remedial works would be too expensive. Should this be the case, it would suggest that these sites are heavily contaminated and pose a potential risk to human health and controlled waters. On this basis I would enquire why these sites are not being investigated as potential "Part 2A" sites. I feel it would make more sense developing the brownfield sites prior to targetting greenfield sites, as the risk and treatment of ground contamination is simply being ignored and delayed. Brownfield sites identified include but not limited to 2117, 2096, 2096A, 2096B, 2096C, 3075

Representation ID: REP01655 Question Ref: H3

Several brownfield sites as detailed earlier (namely 2096, 2096A - C, 3075' 3120, 1018A & B, 2127)

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3075

Housing

Whiteways, Thorpe Lane, Middleton

Name: Lisa Mulherin

Representor No: PRS05734

Representation ID: REP07126 Question Ref: H7

3075 Scrapyard, Thorpe Lane, Middleton – Whilst supposed to be Green Belt this site is currently in use as a scrap yard. Enforcement action is being sought by a Middleton Councillor. The site as it stands extends too far to the South and is not well enough connected to existing settlements. Access onto Thorpe Lane would also need to be well thought out given the bend in the road here.

Name: Neil Dawson

Representor No: PRS05884

Representation ID: REP06563 Question Ref: H7

Site 3075 Thorpe Lane, Middleton

This site is allocated as red but I suggest further consultation with local councillors and the local community to determine if the current allocation should change. It is classed as a Green Belt site but it is a scrapyard and has the look and feel of a Brownfield site.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network. From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Peter Ashton

Representor No: PRS00130

Representation ID: REP04606 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.
I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.
SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:
137A Britannia Road 33
137B Britannia Road 87
141 Tingley Common 36
1018A Topcliffe lane 231
3077A Rein Road 246
3077B Rein Road 124
1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16
The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Brian Guy

Representor No: PRS00142

Representation ID: REP04161 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.
I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.
SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:
137A Britannia Road 33
137B Britannia Road 87
141 Tingley Common 36
1018A Topcliffe lane 231
3077A Rein Road 246
3077B Rein Road 124
1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16
The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that,those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Kathleen Davis

Representor No: PRS00188

Representation ID: REP04521 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Beverley Henry

Representor No: PRS01121

Representation ID: REP04165 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that, those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: S Appleyard

Representor No: PRS01369

Representation ID: REP03492 Question Ref: H7

3077A - Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock. The problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be a need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: K Mason

Representor No: PRS01946

Representation ID: REP04096 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33
137B Britannia Road 87
141 Tingley Common 36
1018A Topcliffe lane 231
3077A Rein Road 246
3077B Rein Road 124
1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first it appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: P Coates

Representor No: PRS01948

Representation ID: REP04130 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33
137B Britannia Road 87
141 Tingley Common 36
1018A Topcliffe lane 231
3077A Rein Road 246
3077B Rein Road 124
1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first it appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: E Kamis

Representor No: PRS01961

Representation ID: REP04146 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that,those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: D Rigby

Representor No: PRS01971

Representation ID: REP04142 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that,those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: B Smith

Representor No: PRS01978

Representation ID: REP04174 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33
137B Britannia Road 87
141 Tingley Common 36
1018A Topcliffe lane 231
3077A Rein Road 246
3077B Rein Road 124
1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Representation ID: REP04622 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33
137B Britannia Road 87
141 Tingley Common 36
1018A Topcliffe lane 231
3077A Rein Road 246
3077B Rein Road 124
1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: M Webster

Representor No: PRS01980

Representation ID: REP04176 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that,those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: P Carter

Representor No: PRS01986

Representation ID: REP04178 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that,those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: D Carter

Representor No: PRS01992

Representation ID: REP04188 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that,those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Elaine Carter

Representor No: PRS01998

Representation ID: REP04194 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that,those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Robert Hall

Representor No: PRS02009

Representation ID: REP04208 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that,those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Emma Price

Representor No: PRS02222

Representation ID: REP04456 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: J Cowie

Representor No: PRS02227

Representation ID: REP04458 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: James Mallinson

Representor No: PRS02229

Representation ID: REP04466 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: J Middleton

Representor No: PRS02231

Representation ID: REP04468 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Barnes

Representor No: PRS02236

Representation ID: REP04471 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Wormald

Representor No: PRS02238

Representation ID: REP04476 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: T White

Representor No: PRS02241

Representation ID: REP04479 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.
I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.
SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:
137A Britannia Road 33
137B Britannia Road 87
141 Tingley Common 36
1018A Topcliffe lane 231
3077A Rein Road 246
3077B Rein Road 124
1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16
The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Brian Dykes

Representor No: PRS02246

Representation ID: REP04482 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Barrett

Representor No: PRS02248

Representation ID: REP04486 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: K Batley

Representor No: PRS02249

Representation ID: REP04487 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: M Farnhill

Representor No: PRS02261

Representation ID: REP04501 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Sandra And Arthur Gawthorpe

Representor No: PRS02265

Representation ID: REP04504 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: P Batley

Representor No: PRS02269

Representation ID: REP04508 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Ann Raistrick

Representor No: PRS02282

Representation ID: REP04524 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: L Leatherly

Representor No: PRS02285

Representation ID: REP04526 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.
I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.
SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:
137A Britannia Road 33
137B Britannia Road 87
141 Tingley Common 36
1018A Topcliffe lane 231
3077A Rein Road 246
3077B Rein Road 124
1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16
The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Helen Ainley

Representor No: PRS02288

Representation ID: REP04528 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Susan Holt

Representor No: PRS02289

Representation ID: REP04532 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Dereck Holt

Representor No: PRS02311

Representation ID: REP04555 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: S Pickering

Representor No: PRS02312

Representation ID: REP04557 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Anne And Alan Britton

Representor No: PRS02313

Representation ID: REP04558 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Helen Guy

Representor No: PRS02314

Representation ID: REP04559 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: R Platt

Representor No: PRS02316

Representation ID: REP04563 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: David Stott

Representor No: PRS02317

Representation ID: REP04565 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: S Roberts

Representor No: PRS02319

Representation ID: REP04567 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.
I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.
SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:
137A Britannia Road 33
137B Britannia Road 87
141 Tingley Common 36
1018A Topcliffe lane 231
3077A Rein Road 246
3077B Rein Road 124
1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16
The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: M McNicholl

Representor No: PRS02321

Representation ID: REP04570 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Jason Beecroft

Representor No: PRS02326

Representation ID: REP04573 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Peter Newsome

Representor No: PRS02328

Representation ID: REP04577 Question Ref: H1

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Jenni Davenport

Representor No: PRS02330

Representation ID: REP04580 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: P Sutton

Representor No: PRS02333

Representation ID: REP04583 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Stephen And Janice Duffy

Representor No: PRS02337

Representation ID: REP04586 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: A Glen

Representor No: PRS02338

Representation ID: REP04588 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Frank Raven

Representor No: PRS02339

Representation ID: REP04589 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Kudlip Kawz

Representor No: PRS02358

Representation ID: REP04607 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Carole Deighton

Representor No: PRS02362

Representation ID: REP04613 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: E Naylor

Representor No: PRS02363

Representation ID: REP04616 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Ava D Platt

Representor No: PRS02370

Representation ID: REP04624 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Kathleen Paver

Representor No: PRS02372

Representation ID: REP04626 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Diane Taylor-reid

Representor No: PRS02374

Representation ID: REP04627 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: C Guy

Representor No: PRS02377

Representation ID: REP04630 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Howard Boyce

Representor No: PRS02384

Representation ID: REP04641 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: J Beldon

Representor No: PRS02385

Representation ID: REP04642 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: A W Cooper

Representor No: PRS02387

Representation ID: REP04644 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Luke Standage

Representor No: PRS02389

Representation ID: REP04646 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: K And C Morrison

Representor No: PRS02397

Representation ID: REP04655 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: G Oxtoby

Representor No: PRS02505

Representation ID: REP07814 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: K Horner

Representor No: PRS02512

Representation ID: REP04789 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: J W Crabtree

Representor No: PRS02514

Representation ID: REP04794 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Harry Vasey

Representor No: PRS02529

Representation ID: REP07823 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: B F Thompson

Representor No: PRS02531

Representation ID: REP04814 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Charles Ollis

Representor No: PRS02532

Representation ID: REP04820 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: S Gamble

Representor No: PRS02535

Representation ID: REP04821 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Jonathan Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02563

Representation ID: REP07833 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: S. R Searle

Representor No: PRS02649

Representation ID: REP05094 Question Ref: H7

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Angela Mallinson

Representor No: PRS02650

Representation ID: REP05095 Question Ref: H7

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Emyr Phillips

Representor No: PRS03789

Representation ID: REP01163 Question Ref: H7

Ref 3077 A & B look suitable.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network. From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077A

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Unidentifiable

Representor No: PRS99999

Representation ID: REP04628 Question Ref: H1

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Peter Ashton

Representor No: PRS00130

Representation ID: REP04606 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Brian Guy

Representor No: PRS00142

Representation ID: REP04161 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that,those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Kathleen Davis

Representor No: PRS00188

Representation ID: REP04521 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Beverley Henry

Representor No: PRS01121

Representation ID: REP04165 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that, those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: S Appleyard

Representor No: PRS01369

Representation ID: REP03492 Question Ref: H7

3077B - Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock. The problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be a need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: K Mason

Representor No: PRS01946

Representation ID: REP04096 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33
137B Britannia Road 87
141 Tingley Common 36
1018A Topcliffe lane 231
3077A Rein Road 246
3077B Rein Road 124
1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first it appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: P Coates

Representor No: PRS01948

Representation ID: REP04130 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33
137B Britannia Road 87
141 Tingley Common 36
1018A Topcliffe lane 231
3077A Rein Road 246
3077B Rein Road 124
1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first it appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: E Kamis

Representor No: PRS01961

Representation ID: REP04146 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that,those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: D Rigby

Representor No: PRS01971

Representation ID: REP04142 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that,those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: B Smith

Representor No: PRS01978

Representation ID: REP04622 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33
137B Britannia Road 87
141 Tingley Common 36
1018A Topcliffe lane 231
3077A Rein Road 246
3077B Rein Road 124
1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Representation ID: REP04174 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33
137B Britannia Road 87
141 Tingley Common 36
1018A Topcliffe lane 231
3077A Rein Road 246
3077B Rein Road 124
1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that,those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: M Webster

Representor No: PRS01980

Representation ID: REP04176 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that,those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: P Carter

Representor No: PRS01986

Representation ID: REP04178 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that,those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: D Carter

Representor No: PRS01992

Representation ID: REP04188 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that,those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Elaine Carter

Representor No: PRS01998

Representation ID: REP04194 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that,those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Robert Hall

Representor No: PRS02009

Representation ID: REP04208 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that,those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Emma Price

Representor No: PRS02222

Representation ID: REP04456 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: J Cowie

Representor No: PRS02227

Representation ID: REP04458 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: James Mallinson

Representor No: PRS02229

Representation ID: REP04466 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: J Middleton

Representor No: PRS02231

Representation ID: REP04468 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Barnes

Representor No: PRS02236

Representation ID: REP04471 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Wormald

Representor No: PRS02238

Representation ID: REP04476 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: T White

Representor No: PRS02241

Representation ID: REP04479 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.
I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.
SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:
137A Britannia Road 33
137B Britannia Road 87
141 Tingley Common 36
1018A Topcliffe lane 231
3077A Rein Road 246
3077B Rein Road 124
1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16
The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Brian Dykes

Representor No: PRS02246

Representation ID: REP04482 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Barrett

Representor No: PRS02248

Representation ID: REP04486 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: K Batley

Representor No: PRS02249

Representation ID: REP04487 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: M Farnhill

Representor No: PRS02261

Representation ID: REP04501 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Sandra And Arthur Gawthorpe

Representor No: PRS02265

Representation ID: REP04504 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: P Batley

Representor No: PRS02269

Representation ID: REP04508 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Ann Raistrick

Representor No: PRS02282

Representation ID: REP04524 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: L Leatherly

Representor No: PRS02285

Representation ID: REP04526 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Helen Ainley

Representor No: PRS02288

Representation ID: REP04528 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Susan Holt

Representor No: PRS02289

Representation ID: REP04532 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Dereck Holt

Representor No: PRS02311

Representation ID: REP04555 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: S Pickering

Representor No: PRS02312

Representation ID: REP04557 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Anne And Alan Britton

Representor No: PRS02313

Representation ID: REP04558 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Helen Guy

Representor No: PRS02314

Representation ID: REP04559 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: R Platt

Representor No: PRS02316

Representation ID: REP04563 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: David Stott

Representor No: PRS02317

Representation ID: REP04565 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: S Roberts

Representor No: PRS02319

Representation ID: REP04567 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: M McNicholl

Representor No: PRS02321

Representation ID: REP04570 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Jason Beecroft

Representor No: PRS02326

Representation ID: REP04573 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Peter Newsome

Representor No: PRS02328

Representation ID: REP04577 Question Ref: H1

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Jenni Davenport

Representor No: PRS02330

Representation ID: REP04580 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: P Sutton

Representor No: PRS02333

Representation ID: REP04583 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Stephen And Janice Duffy

Representor No: PRS02337

Representation ID: REP04586 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: A Glen

Representor No: PRS02338

Representation ID: REP04588 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.
I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.
SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:
137A Britannia Road 33
137B Britannia Road 87
141 Tingley Common 36
1018A Topcliffe lane 231
3077A Rein Road 246
3077B Rein Road 124
1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16
The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Frank Raven

Representor No: PRS02339

Representation ID: REP04589 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Kudlip Kawz

Representor No: PRS02358

Representation ID: REP04607 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Carole Deighton

Representor No: PRS02362

Representation ID: REP04613 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: E Naylor

Representor No: PRS02363

Representation ID: REP04616 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Ava D Platt

Representor No: PRS02370

Representation ID: REP04624 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Kathleen Paver

Representor No: PRS02372

Representation ID: REP04626 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Diane Taylor-reid

Representor No: PRS02374

Representation ID: REP04627 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: C Guy

Representor No: PRS02377

Representation ID: REP04630 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Howard Boyce

Representor No: PRS02384

Representation ID: REP04641 Question Ref: H1

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33
137B Britannia Road 87
141 Tingley Common 36
1018A Topcliffe lane 231
3077A Rein Road 246
3077B Rein Road 124
1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Representation ID: REP04641 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33
137B Britannia Road 87
141 Tingley Common 36
1018A Topcliffe lane 231
3077A Rein Road 246
3077B Rein Road 124
1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: J Beldon

Representor No: PRS02385

Representation ID: REP04642 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: A W Cooper

Representor No: PRS02387

Representation ID: REP04644 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.
I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.
SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:
137A Britannia Road 33
137B Britannia Road 87
141 Tingley Common 36
1018A Topcliffe lane 231
3077A Rein Road 246
3077B Rein Road 124
1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16
The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Luke Standage

Representor No: PRS02389

Representation ID: REP04646 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: K And C Morrison

Representor No: PRS02397

Representation ID: REP04655 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: G Oxtoby

Representor No: PRS02505

Representation ID: REP07814 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: K Horner

Representor No: PRS02512

Representation ID: REP04789 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: J W Crabtree

Representor No: PRS02514

Representation ID: REP04794 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Harry Vasey

Representor No: PRS02529

Representation ID: REP07823 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: B F Thompson

Representor No: PRS02531

Representation ID: REP04814 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Charles Ollis

Representor No: PRS02532

Representation ID: REP04820 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: S Gamble

Representor No: PRS02535

Representation ID: REP04821 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Jonathan Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02563

Representation ID: REP07833 Question Ref: H7

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: S. R Searle

Representor No: PRS02649

Representation ID: REP05094 Question Ref: H7

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Angela Mallinson

Representor No: PRS02650

Representation ID: REP05095 Question Ref: H7

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Emyr Phillips

Representor No: PRS03789

Representation ID: REP01163 Question Ref: H7

Ref 3077 A & B look suitable.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network. From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3077B

Housing

Bulls Head Inn, Dewsbury Road

Name: Unidentifiable

Representor No: PRS99999

Representation ID: REP04628 Question Ref: H1

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3078A

Housing

Hey Beck Lane, Wakefield

Name: Michael Green

Representor No: PRS00053

Representation ID: REP00459 Question Ref: H5

This site appears likely to be accessed of West Lea Drive at the south (presumably that is why the site boundary departs from field boundaries at this point) and also via the farm yard adjacent to no 8A Skye Road. The majority of the traffic will thus use Skye Road, which is already congested in the morning peak at the Dewsbury road traffic lights. Presumably this is why Highways are now doing a traffic count.

Name: Richard Marshall

Representor No: PRS03170

Representation ID: REP01024 Question Ref: H4

2098C, 2105, 2155, 3000, 3056,3064, 3078A, 4004, and 4029. As previously stated the amber sites that are greenbelt land should not be considered for development.

Representation ID: REP01024 Question Ref: H5

1079, 1072, 1077, 1143B, 1143D, 1171B, 1200A, 1258, 1284a, 1285, 1344, 2098a, 3365, 3456A.2098C, 2105, 2155, 3000, 3056,3064, 3078A, 4004, and 4029. As previously stated the amber sites that are greenbelt land should not be considered for development. Site 1032 is designated as a protected area of search this land has been retained along the edge of the existing settlement pending more suitable sites being found in the longer term this site should only be developed as a last resort.

Name: Emyr Phillips

Representor No: PRS03789

Representation ID: REP01163 Question Ref: H4

Ref 3078A, 1067B, 1069 are close to main roads (eg A650) and existing amenities.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3078A

Housing

Hey Beck Lane, Wakefield

Name: Barratt & David Wilson Homes Yorkshire West

Representor No: PRS05643

Representation ID: REP07261 Question Ref: H1

3078A

We object to the rating of site reference 3078A as Amber (sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites). We believe this site should be allocated as Green (sites which have the greatest potential to be allocated for housing) in the Site Allocations Plan.

[See full representation for plans, maps etc which includes promotional document]

The site comprises of predominantly greenfield land on the south western edge of the village of Tingley. To the north eastern corner of the site is a small agricultural holding making it a partly brownfield site. The site is sloping with dense tree coverage on the western side and in that respect has a sense of enclosure. The site is bounded to the north by St Marys Close, east by Skye Road and to the south by open land. The surrounding land uses are residential to the north and east and agricultural to the south. It is currently designated as Green Belt and as an Urban Fringe Priority Area in the Leeds UDPR 2006.

The site is on the edge of the village of Tingley. In terms of local services, the site is approximately 200m away from a One Stop Local (which includes a Post Office), 250m from another small shop and 1.2km away from a Newsagents, Mini-Mart and Takeaway. Further shops and services can be found in Morley, approximately 3km away. Amenities include a Morrisons supermarket, banks, shops, cafes and pubs. Local community facilities include a library, town hall and leisure centre with a gym and swimming pool.

The site has good access to public transport, education and health facilities. There are a number of bus stops are located within 400m from the site on Syke Road and Dewsbury Road. The following services can be accessed.

- 202 / 203 – Leeds Bus Station to Huddersfield Bus Station via White Rose Centre and Dewsbury (every 15 minutes)
- 425 – Wakefield Bus Station to Bradford Interchange (every hour)
- 205 – Pudsey Bus Station to Dewsbury Bus Station (every hour)
- 153 – Morley and Castleford (every 2 hours)

The nearest railway station to the site is 3.1km away in Morley, where there are regular services to Leeds, Huddersfield and Manchester Victoria.

The nearest primary school is Westerton Primary School, 450m away from the site followed by Hill Top Primary School, 1.7km away. The nearest secondary school is Woodkirk Academy, 800m from the site.

With regard to health facilities, the closest doctors surgery is Leigh View Medical Practice located in Tingley 1.9km away from the site. This surgery also has an on-site pharmacy.

Other doctors surgeries are located in Middleton and Morley. The closest dentists is Issacs, Robson and Associates which is located 2.5km away on the A650. Further dentists can be found in Middleton and Morley.

[Representation sets out Core Strategy policies].

The allocation of this site for housing development is consistent with the adopted National Planning Policy Framework. [Representation sets out NPPF policy]. The development of the site is consistent with these objectives.

The National Planning Policy Framework states at paragraph 80 that the Green Belt serves five purposes. The table below assesses this site in relation to these purposes:

To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas - This site is well connected to the built up area and has three boundaries with the existing built

up area. Development of this site would not result in ribbon development of isolated development. Development of this site would round off the western edge of Tingley.

To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another - Development of this site would not lead to neighbouring towns merging into one another as the site is bounded to the north and east by residential development and to the east by Dewsbury Road.

To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - The site does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns - The site is not within or adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other historical feature. Development of this site would have no effect on the setting and special character or historic features.

To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land - Spatial Policy 1 of the Core Strategy advises that an appropriate balance of greenfield and brownfield land will be necessary to deliver the spatial development strategy. There are a few derelict and brownfield sites within the Outer South West housing market area; therefore the development of greenfield sites will be necessary in order to meet the housing requirement in the draft Core Strategy.

Core Strategy Spatial Policy 6 The Housing Requirement and Allocation of Housing Land

sets out that the allocation of housing land is based on criteria such as sustainable locations which meet the standards of public transport accessibility, the least impact on green belt purposes and avoiding areas of flood risk. The development of this site accords with this draft policy.

LCC have identified the reasons this site was rated as Amber in their site review. They stated that the site meets Core Strategy standards with the exception of health and local services. In regard to health services, the LCC accessibility standard states that sites should be within a 20 min walk. The closest doctors surgery is Leigh View Medical Practice located in Tingley and is beyond the desired limit, the 153 bus runs from outside the site on Syke Road to a stop on Westerton Road, approximately 300m from the surgery. The LCC accessibility standard for local services states that sites should be within a 15

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3078A

Housing

Hey Beck Lane, Wakefield

Name: Barratt & David Wilson Homes Yorkshire West

Representor No: PRS05643

minute walk. We have found two local convenience stores, approximately 250m away from the site and consider the LCC scoring to be inaccurate.

Conclusions

The site does not contribute to the purposes of Green Belt. It is well related to the existing settlement and would round off the edge of Tingley. This site offers a logical and sustainable extension to the current urban form and removal from Green Belt. It is a mixed greenfield/brownfield site. The site is close to a Strategic Location for Jobs Growth as identifies in the draft Core Strategy, which is approximately 1.2km away at Junction 28 of the M62. This strategic area for jobs growth needs to be matched with new housing in easily accessible locations. The Syke Road site can already access Junction 28 of the M62 easily via regular bus services, therefore this site provides an ideal location for housing growth. The Outer South West has a housing requirement of 7,200 dwellings, a significant proportion, therefore this site could contribute to this growth. To meet this housing requirement the Site Allocations Plan Issues and Options Document identifies 1,398 dwellings from outstanding planning permissions and UDP housing allocations, and 4,214 dwellings from sites assessed as 'green'. Combined this totals 5,612 and is insufficient to meet the draft housing requirement, therefore a number of sites assessed as 'amber' will be necessary to allocate to meet the identified need for this market area. Deliverable sites such as Dewsbury Road/Syke Road, Tingley should therefore be allocated.

There are no significant environmental or physical constraints which would preclude development on this site. There would be a number of benefits including:

- Delivery of new family housing including open market homes and affordable housing
- Direct and indirect construction jobs
- Section 106 monies in respect of transport, education and public open space
- Increased expenditure in the local economy
- New Homes Bonus
- Provision of new public open space

The site is deliverable when considered against the definition of deliverable in the Framework (footnote 11 of paragraph 47). The site is available now given the agreement in place between the landowners and a national housebuilder. The site is in a sustainable location, suitable for the delivery of housing as detailed in this response. There are no insurmountable physical problems of limitations and as such the site is considered to be suitable for housing. It is considered that this is an achievable site, which has a realistic prospect of being delivered within 5 years; there are no known viability issues restricting the site from coming forward.

Name: Neil Dawson

Representor No: PRS05884

Representation ID: REP06563 Question Ref: H4

Suggested sites from Amber to Red;

309
1067B
1069
1143F
1220A
1274
1275A
1279
1332
2105
2155
3000
3064
3078A
4004

These sites are almost all located within the existing Green Belt and expansion into the Green Belt would lead to increased urban sprawl between the various townships in the Outer South West, and lead to coalescence between communities

Development of the Green Belt sites would also reduce the open green area and provide encroachment into the countryside around Morley and other smaller townships.

In addition there is insufficient road capacity and little scope for expansion for other necessary services. There would be a requirement for new or upgrading of existing roads which would therefore favour development on sites that are already located within the Morley or the Leeds Urban areas rather than eroding the Green Belt further.

Site 3078A is close to potential development in Kirklees and could lead to the complete erosion of the Green Belt and open green space between Leeds and Kirklees.

Any further development at sites 1275A and 1279 would reduce the Green Belt between the existing residential boundary and the A653 Dewsbury Road to a narrow strip which would put pressure in future years to extend residential use further east.

See rep for full details.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3078A

Housing

Hey Beck Lane, Wakefield

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H4

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Amber Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are be minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H4

Agree with amber allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H4

Agree with amber allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3078B

Housing

Hey Beck Lane, Wakefield

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network. From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3120

Housing

Dewsbury Road, Morley

Name: Mark Brennan

Representor No: PRS03782

Representation ID: REP01655 Question Ref: H3

Several brownfield sites as detailed earlier (namely 2096, 2096A - C, 3075' 3120, 1018A & B, 2127)

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network. From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3189

Housing

Bridge Street, Morley

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 4 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' and 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network.

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network)

From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service frequency levels.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites - green sites are linked to this comment]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H1

Agree with green allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H1

Agree with green allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3311

Housing

Land at off Gascoigne Road

Name: Adrian Sail

Representor No: PRS04944

Representation ID: REP01165 Question Ref: H3

SHLAA ref 3311- Gascoigne Road, Thorpe, WakefieldThe site adjoins the eastern boundary of Thorpe and could form a potential extension with Gascoigne Road forming a natural boundary for the settlement. The location of the site between the two sections of Thorpe would link it together to form a more complete urban form in view of its situation adjoining the road bridge across the M62. The settlement of Thorpe has good community services considering its size which include a primary school, a convenience store, pharmacy, hair salon and sports pitches. There is also a bus service running along Gascoigne Road towards the Leeds and Wakefield every hour. Pedestrian and cycle links are also in place between the southern section of Thorpe and the northern section via a foot bridge across the M62 motorway. Road access is adequate with a road linking Thorpe across the M62 and further roads running south linking it with the larger settlements of West and East Ardsley. The development of this site would add to the current infrastructure reducing the settlements reliance on the surrounding villages and facility a more sustainable community. The site currently lies within the Green Belt, however a number of similar Green Belt sites in the locality are categorised as "sites which have greatest potential to be allocated for housing". It is not clear why these sites are preferred to 3311. The site is low value agricultural land and has poor visual amenity caused by its position in the wedge of land between two intersecting motorways and a major railway line. Furthermore the visual value of the land is insignificant in its context as the site lies in a basin which obscures views into the site from the north and south. The site is suitable for development now or for the future expansion of Thorpe which could be put in place by its removal from the Green Belt in this current review of development plans.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3320

Housing

Land off Middleton Lane, LS10 4GY

Name: Brian Guy

Representor No: PRS00142

Representation ID: REP04659 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: Wenda P Whitehead

Representor No: PRS00312

Representation ID: REP04786 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: Janice Beever

Representor No: PRS00441

Representation ID: REP04791 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: P S Barrie

Representor No: PRS00915

Representation ID: REP04781 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Representation ID: REP04810 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Representation ID: REP04769 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: Lynne Paul

Representor No: PRS01169

Representation ID: REP04800 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: D Paul

Representor No: PRS01183

Representation ID: REP04793 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: B Stringer

Representor No: PRS01606

Representation ID: REP04797 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3320

Housing

Land off Middleton Lane, LS10 4GY

Name: L.e Beever

Representor No: PRS01607

Representation ID: REP04804 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: J Cowie

Representor No: PRS02227

Representation ID: REP04768 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: Susan Holt

Representor No: PRS02289

Representation ID: REP04772 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: Dereck Holt

Representor No: PRS02311

Representation ID: REP04766 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: Jenni Davenport

Representor No: PRS02330

Representation ID: REP04770 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: Frank Raven

Representor No: PRS02339

Representation ID: REP04771 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: E Naylor

Representor No: PRS02363

Representation ID: REP04780 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: Kathleen Paver

Representor No: PRS02372

Representation ID: REP04774 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3320

Housing

Land off Middleton Lane, LS10 4GY

Name: C Guy

Representor No: PRS02377

Representation ID: REP04767 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: C Clegg

Representor No: PRS02406

Representation ID: REP04663 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: Doreen Gill

Representor No: PRS02496

Representation ID: REP04755 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: D Naylor

Representor No: PRS02497

Representation ID: REP04773 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: A Paver

Representor No: PRS02498

Representation ID: REP04775 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: James Bowers

Representor No: PRS02500

Representation ID: REP04777 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: Alan Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02501

Representation ID: REP04778 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: Vivienne Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02502

Representation ID: REP04779 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3320

Housing

Land off Middleton Lane, LS10 4GY

Name: Vivian Oxtoby

Representor No: PRS02504

Representation ID: REP04783 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: Beryl Hewitt

Representor No: PRS02506

Representation ID: REP04785 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: D A Clegg

Representor No: PRS02507

Representation ID: REP04788 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: Pauline Wood

Representor No: PRS02508

Representation ID: REP04790 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: Joyce Thompson

Representor No: PRS02510

Representation ID: REP04792 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: Patricia Aston

Representor No: PRS02513

Representation ID: REP04796 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: L. G Wilson

Representor No: PRS02515

Representation ID: REP04799 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: S Laurence

Representor No: PRS02517

Representation ID: REP04801 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3320

Housing

Land off Middleton Lane, LS10 4GY

Name: C Graham

Representor No: PRS02518

Representation ID: REP04803 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: M Allsop

Representor No: PRS02520

Representation ID: REP04805 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: R Hartill

Representor No: PRS02521

Representation ID: REP04806 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: Edith Holmes

Representor No: PRS02522

Representation ID: REP04808 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: Harry Holmes

Representor No: PRS02524

Representation ID: REP04811 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: Ann Morse

Representor No: PRS02526

Representation ID: REP04813 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: L.r Morse

Representor No: PRS02527

Representation ID: REP04816 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: Michael Hartill

Representor No: PRS02556

Representation ID: REP04847 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3320

Housing

Land off Middleton Lane, LS10 4GY

Name: Jim Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02561

Representation ID: REP04852 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: Helen Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02562

Representation ID: REP04855 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: Ronald Gill

Representor No: PRS02564

Representation ID: REP04858 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: A.w Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02565

Representation ID: REP04859 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: J Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02566

Representation ID: REP04860 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Name: Norman Dearden

Representor No: PRS02568

Representation ID: REP04857 Question Ref: H7

This site could be used for housing. 3320 Thorpe Villa, Site Capacity 624, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site could be included in the 'amber' category. Though green belt it is adjacent to existing built developments on the edge of Middleton

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3320

Housing

Land off Middleton Lane, LS10 4GY

Name: J & J Prescott

Representor No: PRS04996

Representation ID: REP02008 Question Ref: H3

Site 3320 and west of to join up with Middleton. Stand alone site that can be developed without risk of coalescence.

Representation ID: REP02008 Question Ref: H6

3320 and west to Middleton as an appropriate housing location.

Representation ID: REP02008 Question Ref: H7

3320 better identified as amber. Relates well to settlement pattern and not as drawn an isolated allocation for which see plan to be annexed. Site 2104, Westfield considered also as an appropriate candidate if additional numbers are required.

Representation ID: REP02008 Question Ref: H11

medium long term

Representation ID: REP02008 Question Ref: General comment

Plan to e submitted for clarity relating to 3320 and westwards extension.

Name: Lisa Mulherin

Representor No: PRS05734

Representation ID: REP07126 Question Ref: H7

3320 Thorpe Villa and Middleton Lane, Thorpe – I support the Red designation of this site for the reasons set out in the consultation document and because of the need to retain the separation between settlements.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3320

Housing

Land off Middleton Lane, LS10 4GY

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3350

Housing

309 Leeds Road Lofthouse

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H4

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 4 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' and 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network.

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network)

From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service frequency levels.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites - amber sites are linked to this comment]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3365

Housing

Westerton Road, Tingley, Leeds

Name: Alan Weldon

Representor No: PRS01062

Representation ID: REP03126 Question Ref: H1

1258, 3365 Westerton Road - Green to Red
Last open view in West Ardsley / Tingley

Name: H I Weldon

Representor No: PRS01063

Representation ID: REP03127 Question Ref: H1

1258, 3365 Westerton Road - Green top Red
Last open view in West Ardsley / Tingley

Name: A V Jarvis

Representor No: PRS01112

Representation ID: REP03164 Question Ref: H1

Sites 1258 and 3365

117 houses on two greenfield sites creating a continuous built up area along Westerton Road. Again a degradation of the living environment for present residents. Traffic problems would be made worse as Westerton Road narrows considerably near these sites before the traffic lights onto A650.

Name: Michael Stilwell

Representor No: PRS01133

Representation ID: REP03207 Question Ref: H1

3365

Lack of amenities – the amenities in the area cannot support the existing population of West Ardsley, never mind accepting an influx of possibly 5000 more.

- Virtually all the shops have closed over the years, there are now only 3 grocery shops in the area. Anyone living at the southern end of Haigh Moor Road has over 1 mile to travel to the nearest shop.
- The schools are overcrowded, Westerton Road has had more external classrooms added, so it cannot be extended. Hill Top School is nearly full now from the existing population growth, again it is extremely limited in expansion possibilities.
- Bus services are pathetic, services to Leeds, Dewsbury and Wakefield are hourly at best. Batley is only accessible from Wakefield – Batley Road. There are areas where buses have been removed completely. This week another service has been stopped.
- There are not any play areas for children, your own survey records this failing.
- There is only one medical centre with 8 doctors giving cover to some existing 15000 patients. To get an appointment with a specific GP can take 3 weeks, the centre has recently been extended to its limits so there is nowhere to go. Also there is only one pharmacist.

Traffic

All the roads in the area are in a bad state of repair, I have lived here for 28 years and Haigh Moor Road has never been resurfaced despite 3 new housing estates accessing it. In June 1992 the planning inspector denied a planning application (91/23/00350) for an annex for an invalid because although neither he nor his brother drove. The reason for this was "I am concerned that were an additional dwelling to be provided there would be no guarantee that it would not lead to additional traffic generation at some future time, perhaps through changed circumstances, with consequent adverse impact on highway safety." Yet here we are with a further 70 houses at Foxfields and Jude's Pond and a proposed 179 on these new sites, probably adding in excess of 500 vehicles to Haigh Moor Road.

There has been a water leak on HMR which despite being reported to Yorkshire Water is still flowing after 3 months and has now become 2 leaks. The western end of Westerton Road is in a dangerous state with potholes and speed restriction bumps. LCC appears to be unable to keep up with the maintenance of its roads in South Leeds.

LCC's attitude to this area seems to be that Ardsley is an outpost on the borders with Wakefield and Kirklees and beyond the borough or Morley, so we can be conveniently ignored. Ardsley is quite definitely being asked to provide the lion's share of new housing without any benefit, it has poor services and has become a dormitory area of Leeds.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3365

Housing

Westerton Road, Tingley, Leeds

Name: Tim Chapman

Representor No: PRS01644

Representation ID: REP03799 Question Ref: H1

1336 /1258 / 1032 / 3365 / 1143B / 1143D I am making my response by letter; the online boxes rejected my comments because they exceed 3,000 digits.

3373A Haigh Wood, West Ardsley, 3373C Haigh Wood, West Ardsley,
1336 Westerton Road, West Ardsley, 3456A Ardsley Reservoir,
1258 Westerton Road, Tingley, 3365 Westerton Road, Tingley,
1032 Bradford Road, 1143B & 1143D Thorpe Lane, Tingley.

Objections.
The Core Strategy seeks to be "fair". The word is used in paragraph 1.2 and again in 1.14. Yet the proposed green housing sites when taken together would definitely not be fair to West Ardsley and Tingley. No justification has been given as to why there is such a concentration here, nor any evidence of local need. Indeed, paragraph 4.6.14 states that "The SHMA 2011 was not able to identify any geographically specific need for new housing based on population growth." The 13 green housing sites in Ardsley and Tingley seem to have been assessed individually rather than their cumulative impact. This impact is potentially very much greater when considered alongside Kirklees Council's proposals for the Chidswell area, and comes on top of the huge impact on West Ardsley of major housing development in the 1990s - the estates now accessed by Lowry Road and Constable Road. The newly proposed sites taken together would consolidate semi-rural groups of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area. Most of the open frontages to Bradford Road and Westerton Road would be built on, removing open aspects and distant views and tending towards the creation of amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the length of the A650.

Representation ID: REP05648 Question Ref: H1

Local Development Framework, Site Allocations Plan, Public Consultation.

I am making my response by letter; the online boxes rejected my comments because they exceed 3,000 digits.

3373A Haigh Wood, West Ardsley, 3373C Haigh Wood, West Ardsley,
1336 Westerton Road, West Ardsley, 3456A Ardsley Reservoir,
1258 Westerton Road, Tingley, 3365 Westerton Road, Tingley,
1032 Bradford Road, 1143B & 1143D Thorpe Lane, Tingley.

Objections.
The Core Strategy seeks to be "fair". The word is used in paragraph 1.2 and again in 1.14. Yet the proposed green housing sites when taken together would definitely not be fair to West Ardsley and Tingley. No justification has been given as to why there is such a concentration here, nor any evidence of local need. Indeed, paragraph 4.6.14 states that "The SHMA 2011 was not able to identify any geographically specific need for new housing based on population growth." The 13 green housing sites in Ardsley and Tingley seem to have been assessed individually rather than their cumulative impact. This impact is potentially very much greater when considered alongside Kirklees Council's proposals for the Chidswell area, and comes on top of the huge impact on West Ardsley of major housing development in the 1990s - the estates now accessed by Lowry Road and Constable Road. The newly proposed sites taken together would consolidate semi-rural groups of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area. Most of the open frontages to Bradford Road and Westerton Road would be built on, removing open aspects and distant views and tending towards the creation of amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the length of the A650.

Name: Caroline Proctor

Representor No: PRS02096

Representation ID: REP04315 Question Ref: H9

3365 – As this is green belt land it should be protected. It is currently used for growing crops, so if built on valuable food production would be lost.

Representation ID: REP04315 Question Ref: H2

3365 – As this is a green belt site it shouldn't be built on. It is currently used for growing crops. There are already two new developments been built on Westerton Road and a further 83 houses will create a lot of traffic onto Westerton Road and surrounding roads which are already very busy.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3365

Housing

Westerton Road, Tingley, Leeds

Name: Richard Marshall
Representor No: PRS03170

Representation ID: REP01024 Question Ref: H5

1079, 1072, 1077, 1143B, 1143D, 1171B, 1200A, 1258, 1284a, 1285, 1344, 2098a, 3365, 3456A.2098C, 2105, 2155, 3000, 3056.3064, 3078A, 4004, and 4029. As previously stated the amber sites that are greenbelt land should not be considered for development. Site 1032 is designated as a protected area of search this land has been retained along the edge of the existing settlement pending more suitable sites being found in the longer term this site should only be developed as a last resort.

Representation ID: REP01024 Question Ref: H2

1079, 1072, 1077, 1143B, 1143D, 1171B, 1200A, 1258, 1284a, 1285, 1344, 2098a, 3365, 3456A. All these sites are green belt sites , green belt land is there to stop urban sprawl and the destruction of the countryside that still remains in this area. If sites 1143B, 1143D, 1143F,2155, 1274, 1032, and 2128 are built on East Ardsley West Ardsley and Tingley will just become one built up area hemmed in by the M62. Not all of these are greenbelt sites but if the development is allowed the basic principal of having greenbelt in this area will be completely wrecked!

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3365

Housing

Westerton Road, Tingley, Leeds

Name: Camille Leach

Representor No: PRS03615

Representation ID: REP00848 Question Ref: H1

sites 3373A, 3373B, 3365,1258,site 1330B 464 houses in such a small vicinity is unsustainable, there are currently just over 300 pupils at Hill Top Primary School with no room for any expansion, the school is full and the same is true of Westerton. Leeds City Council have in their allocation plan confirmed that Ardsley and Robin Hood have a deficiency in parks and gardens (the only area in Leeds South West to be deficient)natural greenspace should be used to reduce the deficit and improve our community. Our GP surgeries are at breaking point the surgery at Leigh View was recently extended and it's difficult to envisage how this could be extended further.Further erosion of the demarcation between West Ardsley & Tingley – , the two areas will be barely distinguishable from each other which is contrary to the Councils policy SP1 which clearly states smaller Settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlement's size, function and sustainability. If these plans were approved it will no doubt result in urban sprawl with no identifiable boundaries. Our fields provide a public amenity development would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This view was endorsed by the Secretary of State in their past decision letter.Our road network was not built to support the existing volume of traffic , we do not have the infrastructure to support development of this scale, our public transport links are very poor with only one bus an hour into Leeds, the only viable means of transportation is by car which will have a cumulative impact on the A650 and A653 which are already congested.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3365

Housing

Westerton Road, Tingley, Leeds

Name: Camille Leach

Representor No: PRS03615

Representation ID: REP00848 Question Ref: General comment

Site 3373C Objections1. Local character and identityDevelopment of this site would be contrary to the following sections of the Council's policy SP1 in the Core Strategy:1. SP1 (i) states: "Smaller Settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlement's size, function and sustainability." Site 3373A, with its estimated capacity of 130 dwellings, does not have regard to the size, function and sustainability of West Ardsley.SP1 (iii) states: "For development to respect and enhance the local character and identity of places and neighbourhoods". The local character and identity of West Ardsley would be seriously threatened by 3373a, 3373C and 1336, and would make its component areas of Upper Green, Haigh Moor and Hill Top barely distinguishable from each other.My view accords with three decision letters from the Planning Inspectorate which were used in the Council's own evidence to the Unitary Development Plan public inquiry in 1995. In paragraph 39 of his report on the Morley Local Plan, the inspector considered that the planned development at Haigh Wood (site WA2H) would have a "very serious impact upon the character and environment of West Ardsley". He concluded in paragraph 10: "In the past, development in the Morley area would appear to have been sporadic and opportunist, placing the identity of the smaller settlements at risk and tending towards the creation of amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the length of the A650 Bradford to Wakefield road. In my view, the further diffusion of the existing loosely-knit settlement pattern should, as far as possible, be resisted."Considering appeals in 1986 on 81/23/00212 and 81/23/00213 (broadly the same area as LDF sites 3373A/B/C and 1336) the inspector said "It would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This was endorsed in the Secretary of State's decision letter.In 1994, a third inspector dismissed an appeal to develop land at Arthington Close near the edge of Haigh Wood because it would "unacceptably erode the fringe of this rural area and would lead to pressure for further encroachment of residential development, most particularly in the fields to the west..."Although some years have passed since these decisions, the character and environment of the area are still semi-rural and just as delicate. When cogent arguments have been repeatedly made against development of the 3373 areas by the Secretary of State, by three planning inspectors and by Leeds Council itself (in evidence to the UDP inquiry), there can be no justification for sites 3373A, 3373C and 1336 being pursued for residential development in the LDF. They should instead be reclassified as "red" and withdrawn from consideration for development when producing the next stage of the plan.2. Damage to Haigh Wood and Baghill beck valleyDevelopment of this site would be contrary to the Council's policy P12 in the Core Strategy:"The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes, including their historical and cultural significance, will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness through stewardship and the planning process." The secluded Haigh Wood valley comprises the central portion of site 3373A, including part of the wood covered by a Tree Preservation Order. Residential development would prejudice the objectives underlining this policy as set out in paragraphs 5.3.46 to 5.3.48 of the Core Strategy including: "The Council seeks to protect and enhance the varied landscapes of Leeds and the assets they contain, from valued local trees, the countryside to nationally designated landscape, fauna and flora". This view was endorsed by three planning inspectors and again in the Council's evidence, given by Mr G B Andrews, at the UDP inquiry. In his paragraph 4.3.6, Mr Andrews stated: I refer to the conclusions reached by the inspectors at the two subsequent appeal cases in 1985 and 1994. In each case it is acknowledged that the Haigh Wood area is of value as an area of attractive open farmland with a rural character and provides an important amenity in the local area". Even the Council's own assessment for the LDF states that the site is: "Not supported (RED). This site includes Haigh Wood and Baghill Beck Local Nature Area which fall under UK Biological Action Plan priority habitats - a mixture of woodland, scrub and grassland habitats alongside Baghill Beck. There are a number of wide hedgerow/woodland belts throughout the site that provide a valuable habitat. Water vole has been recorded on the Hey Beck. The Baghill Beck flows into this water course and could support this species. Bats to consider."3. FairnessThe Core Strategy seeks to be "fair". The word is used in paragraph 1.2 and again in 1.14. Yet the proposed green housing sites when taken together would definitely not be fair to West Ardsley and Tingley. No justification has been given as to why there is such a concentration here, nor any evidence of local need. Indeed, paragraph 4.6.14 states that "The SHMA 2011 was not able to identify any geographically specific need for new housing based on population growth." The sites seem to have been assessed individually rather than their cumulative impact. This impact is potentially very much greater when considered alongside Kirklees Council's proposals for the Chidswell area. 4. Highway access The Upper Green culs-de-sac and Hill Top Lane cul-de-sacs are not suitable to serve more houses. They would become much less safe for children to play in and the already severe dangers at school times would be exacerbated.5. SchoolsPrimary and secondary schools already full and difficult to expand further.6. Agricultural landGood quality agricultural land would be lost.7. ViabilityExtra costs from: a. parts of 3373A and 3373C have serious levels problems and look undevelopable; b. bell pits known to exist in the area from former mining; c. elimination of Japanese Knotweed.The site on Westerton Road from Regency Gardens to Westerton Wood if developed will see 117 new homes - this land is currently classed as green belt (site 3365 = 83 homes and site 1258 = 34 homes) development here will represent a major incursion into the Green belt and will create further pressure on Ardsley reservoir as a local beauty spot. Development of sites 3365 and 1258 will result in the loss of valuable agricultural land, there are a number of wide hedgerow and woodland belts throughout the site that provide a valuable habitat for wildlife in particular bats. Development of the sites on Westerton Road will result in the amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the whole length of the Westerton Road.Site 1330B is an extension of the building that is currently ongoing adjacent to Jude's pond - and is for a further 32 houses ! This site has major highways access issues and has less than the recommended visibility splay for highways safety - further development of this site will exasperate current problems regarding drainage on the land - Haigh Moor Road residents already have to deal with flooding of the pavements and highways in the vicinity of Jude's pond. 464 houses in such a small vicinity is unsustainable, there are currently just over 300 pupils at Hill Top Primary School with no room for any expansion, the school is full and the same is true of Westerton which as you know was a small village school 20 years ago but is now one of the biggest primary schools in the Leeds district and all because of the amount of building that has taken place over recent years.Leeds City Council have in their allocation plan confirmed that Ardsley and Robin Hood have a deficiency in parks and gardens (the only area in Leeds South West to be deficient) - our children already have very little designated play areas, they have also confirmed that we are deficient in outdoor sports areas and facilities for children to play. We have however got a surplus of natural green space which is currently under threat of housing - if this natural greenspace is to be used for any purpose, surely it should be used to reduce the deficit and improve our community. Further reduction of amenity greenspace in an area which is seeing more and more housing development is unfair and unsustainable.Our GP surgeries are at breaking point with current waiting times for appointments being in excess of two weeks, the surgery at Leigh View was recently extended and it's difficult to envisage how this could be extended further to serve the population boom that will ensue if all these sites are developed.Further erosion of the demarcation between West Ardsley & Tingley - soon the two settlements will merge into one and West Ardsley as a separate community will be subsumed into its near neighbour, the two areas will be barely distinguishable from each other which is contrary to the Councils policy SP1 which clearly states smaller Settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlement's size, function and sustainability. If these plans were approved it will no doubt result in urban sprawl with no identifiable boundaries.Our fields provide a public amenity for dog-walkers, cyclists, ramblers and local residents alike and it would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This view was endorsed by the Secretary of State in their past decision letter.Our road network was not built to support the existing volume of traffic , we do not have the infrastructure to support development of this scale, our public transport links are very poor with only one bus an hour into Leeds, the only viable means of transportation is by car which will have a cumulative impact on the A650 and A653 which are already congested.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3365

Housing

Westerton Road, Tingley, Leeds

Name: Camille Leach

Representor No: PRS03615

Name: Edward Dawson

Representor No: PRS03703

Representation ID: REP01365 Question Ref: H2

Sites 1258 + 3365. The close proximity to Westerton woods which is protected and the reservoir plus the damage to wildlife in the area. There are already a large number of new builds in the area ie Common Lane, Thorp and East Ardsley many of which remain unsold. Pressures on schools and medical facilities, an increase in what is already heavy traffic area. Schools in the area are already over subscribed with no plans for expansion. New developments would not enhance or improve any part of the area only place more stress on existing infrastructure.

Name: Christine Leach

Representor No: PRS04208

Representation ID: REP01169 Question Ref: H2

sites 3365,1258 & 3373c Sites 3365 & 1258 are on green belt land & will also spoil Ardsley reservoir which is a local beauty spot used by many local people myself included as I walk round it almost every day. It is also used by lots of other people for leisure activities such as walking clubs. It will also result in a loss of agricultural land & valuable hedgerows. Site 3373c Has insufficient highways infrastructure for yet another 144 houses & would mean that Tingley & West Ardsley could no longer remain as separate villages & the communities would lose one of its last valuable open sites for outdoor enjoyment.

Name: Pamela Caveen

Representor No: PRS04212

Representation ID: REP00768 Question Ref: H14

Perhaps some of the smaller sites could be used for his purpose, e.g 1258, 3365. This type of housing would perhaps not lead to a dramatic increase in traffic as some other schemes would, but again consideration would need to be given to provision of care services in the area, as elderly people may place more demands on these.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3365

Housing

Westerton Road, Tingley, Leeds

Name: Andrea Heibel

Representor No: PRS05109

Representation ID: REP05689 Question Ref: H1

Please note my objections to the proposed developments below.
The proposal for site 3373A (This is the site that runs from the top of Baghill around the back of Arthington Close and Upper Green and will finish on Westerton Road opposite Lonsdale Rise) is to build 130 houses. Lee gap Fair is held twice a year in these fields, the fair is the oldest horse fair in England dating back to 1136 and forms part of the history and heritage of the area.
The 3373C site which will run from the top of Hilltop Lane and carve up all the fields from there to Nook Green on Haigh Moor Road is for 144 houses. It can be argued that the highways infrastructure for Site 3373B is inadequate, there are Highways concerns re poor accessibility for the number of houses proposed and then there is the issue of Highways safety with the junction of Hilltop Lane being within 100 metres of the primary school. All the issues on the attached letter are also relevant for site 3773C.
The site on Westerton Road from Regency Gardens to Westerton Wood if developed will see 117 new homes - this land is currently classed as green belt (site 3365 = 83 homes and site 1258 = 34 homes) development here will represent a major incursion into the Green belt and will create further pressure on Ardsley reservoir as a local beauty spot.
Development of sites 3365 and 1258 will result in the loss of valuable agricultural land, there are a number of wide hedgerow and woodland belts throughout the site that provide a valuable habitat for wildlife in particular bats.
Development of the sites on Westerton Road will result in the amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the whole length of the Westerton Road.
Site 1330B is an extension of the building that is currently ongoing adjacent to Jude's pond - and is for a further 32 houses ! This site has major highways access issues and has less than the recommended visibility splay for highways safety - further development of this site will exasperate current problems regarding drainage on the land - Haigh Moor Road residents already have to deal with flooding of the pavements and highways in the vicinity of Jude's pond.
Please note that all these sites are in addition to any planning applications that have already been approved.
464 houses in such a small vicinity is unsustainable, there are currently just over 300 pupils at Hill Top Primary School with no room for any expansion, the school is full and the same is true of Westerton which as you know was a small village school 20 years ago but is now one of the biggest primary schools in the Leeds district and all because of the amount of building that has taken place over recent years.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3365

Housing

Westerton Road, Tingley, Leeds

Name: Andrea Heibel

Representor No: PRS05109

Leeds City Council have in their allocation plan confirmed that Ardsley and Robin Hood have a deficiency in parks and gardens (the only area in Leeds South West to be deficient) - our children already have very little designated play areas, they have also confirmed that we are deficient in outdoor sports areas and facilities for children to play. We have however got a surplus of natural green space which is currently under threat of housing - if this natural greenspace is to be used for any purpose, surely it should be used to reduce the deficit and improve our community. Further reduction of amenity greenspace in an area which is seeing more and more housing development is unfair and unsustainable. Our GP surgeries are at breaking point with current waiting times for appointments being in excess of two weeks, the surgery at Leigh View was recently extended and it's difficult to envisage how this could be extended further to serve the population boom that will ensue if all these sites are developed. Further erosion of the demarcation between West Ardsley & Tingley - soon the two settlements will merge into one and West Ardsley as a separate community will be subsumed into its near neighbour, the two areas will be barely distinguishable from each other which is contrary to the Councils policy SP1 which clearly states smaller Settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlement's size, function and sustainability. If these plans were approved it will no doubt result in urban sprawl with no identifiable boundaries. Our fields provide a public amenity for dog-walkers, cyclists, ramblers and local residents alike and It would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This view was endorsed by the Secretary of State in their past decision letter. Our road network was not built to support the existing volume of traffic , we do not have the infrastructure to support development of this scale, our public transport links are very poor with only one bus an hour into Leeds, the only viable means of transportation is by car which will have a cumulative impact on the A650 and A653 which are already congested. I look forward to your response and confirmation that these developments will not go ahead

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3365

Housing

Westerton Road, Tingley, Leeds

Name: Lynsey Morris

Representor No: PRS05111

Representation ID: REP05692 Question Ref: H1

Hi,

I would like to object against the planning proposals for the following sites on Map 33 (off Westerton Road)

1336

3373B

3373A

1330B

33732

3365

3373C

3456A

3456B

1258

I suggest that these should all be changed to RED due to the following reasons:

Too much traffic already so roads will be extremely busy right outside my front door. I have young children and will be scared for their safety.

Services such as Doctors surgery's, dentists, local hospitals, schools, supermarkets already too busy so won't be able to cope

Less water will be absorbed into the ground resulting in more flooding in our gardens.

This is currently already happening in several houses on Westerton Road including mine.

There are bats, foxes, owls, frogs, newts and many birds living in the area especially on sites 1336, 3373A, 3373B, 3373C. Should these not be protected?

House prices for homeowners in the area already will decrease.

We moved to the area because of the greenery and our view will be spoilt.

The sewerage system in place on Westerton Road recently failed causing waste from the sewers to overflow into nearby houses. This was due to the recent housing developments that have recently been built nearby so the sewerage system was unable to cope. This could very likely happen again.

Name: D, M, S Johnson And Kenny

Representor No: PRS05119

Representation ID: REP05702 Question Ref: General comment

Firstly I would like to express my disappointment and embarrassment towards the councils plans for the proposed plans listed below. I understand the reason behind the lack of communication with the residents in the area may be beneficial to the local council and certain government groups. It obviously cuts down on man hours and paperwork.

I would like to object against the planning proposals for the following sites on Map 33 (off Westerton Road)

1336

3373B

3373A

1330B

33732

3365

3373C

3456A

3456B

1258

The infrastructure in this area will struggle to cope with the demands of the services required.

The area is attracting wildlife not seen in built up areas. It seems a shame to disregard the wildlife issue I'm sure if a full environmental survey of the area was to be carried out this would scupper the planning permission. But again that would be an extra cost to the council which would have an impact at year end when the books are balanced.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3365

Housing

Westerton Road, Tingley, Leeds

Name: Ian Morris

Representor No: PRS05121

Representation ID: REP05700 Question Ref: H1

Firstly I would like to express my disappointment and embarrassment towards the councils plans for the proposed plans listed below. I understand the reason behind the lack of communication with the residents in the area may be beneficial to the local council and certain government groups. It obviously cuts down on man hours and paperwork.

I would like to object against the planning proposals for the following sites on Map 33 (off Westerton Road)

- 1336
- 3373B
- 3373A
- 1330B
- 33732
- 3365
- 3373C
- 3456A
- 3456B
- 1258

The infrastructure in this area will struggle to cope with the demands of the services required.

The area is attracting wildlife not seen in built up areas. It seems a shame to disregard the wildlife issue I'm sure if a full environmental survey of the area was to be carried out this would scupper the planning permission. But again that would be an extra cost to the council which would have an impact at year end when the books are balanced.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3365

Housing

Westerton Road, Tingley, Leeds

Name: Stephen Cowling

Representor No: PRS05177

Representation ID: REP05759 Question Ref: H1

I wish to object to 3373A, 3373B & 3373C.

[x]

I wish to object on the following grounds:

. The Haigh Wood site reference is 3373, and it is split into 3 parts:

. 3373A is land between Westerton Road & Haigh Wood. This has been assessed as suitable for residential development, with a capacity of 130 houses.

. 3373B is Haigh Wood itself. This has been assessed as unsuitable for residential development because of the topography of the site and access

. 3373C is the fields between Haigh Wood & Woollin Crescent, linking right round to Nook Farm.

The proposal for site 3373A (This is the site that runs from the top of Baghill around the back of Arthington Close and Upper Green and will finish on Westerton Road opposite Lonsdale Rise) is to build 130 houses. Lee gap Fair is held twice a year in these fields, the fair is the oldest horse fair in England dating back to 1136 and forms part of the history and heritage of the area.

The 3373C site which will run from the top of Hilltop Lane and carve up all the fields from there to Nook Green on Haigh Moor Road is for 144 houses. It can be argued that the highways infrastructure for Site 3373B is inadequate, there are Highways concerns re poor accessibility for the number of houses proposed and then there is the issue of Highways safety with the junction of Hilltop Lane being within 100 metres of the primary school. All the issues on the attached letter are also relevant for site 3373C.

The site on Westerton Road from Regency Gardens to Westerton Wood if developed will see 117 new homes - this land is currently classed as green belt (site 3365 = 83 homes and site 1258 = 34 homes) development here will represent a major incursion into the Green belt and will create further pressure on Ardsley reservoir as a local beauty spot. Development of sites 3365 and 1258 will result in the loss of valuable agricultural land, there are a number of wide hedgerow and woodland belts throughout the site that provide a valuable habitat for wildlife in particular bats. Development of the sites on Westerton Road will result in the amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the whole length of the Westerton Road. Site 1330B is an extension of the building that is currently ongoing adjacent to Jude's pond - and is for a further 32 houses ! This site has major highways access issues and has less than the recommended visibility splay for highways safety - further development of this site will exasperate current problems regarding drainage on the land - Haigh Moor Road residents already have to deal with flooding of the pavements and highways in the vicinity of Jude's pond.

Please note that all these sites are in addition to any planning applications that have already been approved.

464 houses in such a small vicinity is unsustainable, there are currently just over 300 pupils at Hill Top Primary School with no room for any expansion, the school is full and the same is true of Westerton which as you know was a small village school 20 years ago but is now one of the biggest primary schools in the Leeds district and all because of the amount of building that has taken place over recent years.

Leeds City Council have in their allocation plan confirmed that Ardsley and Robin Hood have a deficiency in parks and gardens (the only area in Leeds South West to be deficient) - our children already have very little designated play areas, they have also confirmed that we are deficient in outdoor sports areas and facilities for children to play. We have however got a surplus of natural green space which is currently under threat of housing - if this natural greenspace is to be used for any purpose, surely it should be used to reduce the deficit and improve our community. Further reduction of amenity greenspace in an area which is seeing more and more housing development is unfair and unsustainable.

Our GP surgeries are at breaking point with current waiting times for appointments being in excess of two weeks, the surgery at Leigh View was recently extended and it's difficult to envisage how this could be extended further to serve the population boom that will ensue if all these sites are developed.

Further erosion of the demarcation between West Ardsley & Tingley - soon the two settlements will merge into one and West Ardsley as a separate community will be subsumed into its near neighbour, the two areas will be barely distinguishable from each other which is contrary to the Councils policy SP1 which clearly states smaller Settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlement's size, function and sustainability. If these plans were approved it will no doubt

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3365

Housing

Westerton Road, Tingley, Leeds

Name: Stephen Cowling

Representor No: PRS05177

result in urban sprawl with no identifiable boundaries.
Our fields provide a public amenity for dog-walkers, cyclists, ramblers and local residents alike and It would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This view was endorsed by the Secretary of State in their past decision letter.
Our road network was not built to support the existing volume of traffic , we do not have the infrastructure to support development of this scale, our public transport links are very poor with only one bus an hour into Leeds, the only viable means of transportation is by car which will have a cumulative impact on the A650 and A653 which are already congested
I trust that this is in order.
Regards
[x]

Name: Lisa Mulherin

Representor No: PRS05734

Representation ID: REP07126 Question Ref: H1

3365 Westerton Road, Tingley – this site is too large and sprawling. A smaller scale proposal might have been supportable here. The site proposed eats too far in to the Green Belt and would alongside the adjoining site be unsustainable in this location because of pressure on existing amenities (schools and GPs especially.)

Name: Redrow Homes

Representor No: PRS05770

Representation ID: REP06451 Question Ref: H1

Site 3365

We support the rating of site reference 3365, Westerton Road, Tingley as Green (sites which have the greatest potential to be allocated for housing). We believe that this site should be allocated for housing in the Site Allocations Plan.

See attached promotional brochure.

See also representation submitted for full details.

Name: The Sir Robert Ogden Partnership Ltd

Representor No: PRS05834

Representation ID: REP06542 Question Ref: H1

Site 2127

There are four sites, two to the north of West Ardsley and two to the south which are identified as green sites (refs: 1143B, 1143D, 1258 and 3365). These sites currently lie within the Green Belt. The Council have identified these sites as having the greatest potential to be allocated for housing and are therefore colour coded green.

We do not agree that these sites are the most suitable for housing, when the Tingley Station site, which does not lie within the Green Belt has been identified as an amber site. The Tingley Station site has far greater potential to be allocated for housing and deliver a large quantum of dwellings for the Outer South West area without the need for the loss of Green Belt land in this area.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3365

Housing

Westerton Road, Tingley, Leeds

Name: Neil Dawson

Representor No: PRS05884

Representation ID: REP06563 Question Ref: H1

Suggested sites from Green to Red;

1029
1072
1143B
1143D
1200A
1258
1344
3365
3373A
3373C
3456A

All of the above sites are in the current Green Belt with the exception of the 3373A and 3373C which are open land.

The other sites are all located within the existing Green Belt and any development would lead to increased urban sprawl between the various townships in the Outer South West, and lead to coalescence between communities.

Development of the Green Belt sites would also reduce the open green area between settlements and create encroachment into the countryside around Morley.

In addition there is insufficient road capacity in the area particularly the very busy single carriageway A650 from East Ardsley to Tingley. Even if there is no development of the above sites there is in the allocation plan over 1,200 additional new houses close to the A650 which will put additional strain on this busy road.

The Haigh Moor sites are part of a natural valley which is popular for recreational activities. The whole site is considered best treated as one, therefore if the largest part 3373B is not to be used for housing then the other parts of the site should be treated in a similar manner. This should be retained as open green space.

Site 1072 is in the Green Belt and although there are properties adjacent it is located near to the A653 and shares similar characteristics to site 3078B which is not considered suitable for development. A development at this site would set a precedent for incursion into the Green Belt between Leeds and Kirklees.

See rep for full details.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 1 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if these sites would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. Significant developer contributions will be required at these sites to improve the public transport to meet the council LDF accessibility policies; particularly in the larger sites should these be brought forward for development. These include SHLAA ref: 2062, 1032, 1046, 1017 & 1055.

Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small sites low capacity are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

The table also includes accessibility assessments results to access other services and facilities within acceptable journey times on public transport.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3365

Housing

Westerton Road, Tingley, Leeds

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H1

Disagree with Council's green assessment, think the site should be red

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H1

Disagree with Council's green assessment, think the site should be red

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3372

Housing

Baghill Road, West Ardsley, Morley

Name: Michael Stilwell

Representor No: PRS01133

Representation ID: REP03207 Question Ref: H7

3372

Lack of amenities – the amenities in the area cannot support the existing population of West Ardsley, never mind accepting an influx of possibly 5000 more.

- Virtually all the shops have closed over the years, there are now only 3 grocery shops in the area. Anyone living at the southern end of Haigh Moor Road has over 1 mile to travel to the nearest shop.

- The schools are overcrowded, Westerton Road has had more external classrooms added, so it cannot be extended. Hill Top School is nearly full now from the existing population growth, again it is extremely limited in expansion possibilities.

- Bus services are pathetic, services to Leeds, Dewsbury and Wakefield are hourly at best. Batley is only accessible from Wakefield –Batley Road. There are areas where buses have been removed completely. This week another service has been stopped.

- There are not any play areas for children, your own survey records this failing.

- There is only one medical centre with 8 doctors giving cover to some existing 15000 patients. To get an appointment with a specific GP can take 3 weeks, the centre has recently been extended to its limits so there is nowhere to go. Also there is only one pharmacist.

Traffic

All the roads in the area are in a bad state of repair, I have lived here for 28 years and Haigh Moor Road has never been resurfaced despite 3 new housing estates accessing it. In June 1992 the planning inspector denied a planning application (91/23/00350) for an annex for an invalid because although neither he nor his brother drove. The reason for this was "I am concerned that were an additional dwelling to be provided there would be no guarantee that it would not lead to additional traffic generation at some future time, perhaps through changed circumstances, with consequent adverse impact on highway safety." Yet here we are with a further 70 houses at Foxfields and Jude's Pond and a proposed 179 on these new sites, probably adding in excess of 500 vehicles to Haigh Moor Road.

There has been a water leak on HMR which despite being reported to Yorkshire Water is still flowing after 3 months and has now become 2 leaks. The western end of Westerton Road is in a dangerous state with potholes and speed restriction bumps. LCC appears to be unable to keep up with the maintenance of its roads in South Leeds.

LCC's attitude to this area seems to be that Ardsley is an outpost on the borders with Wakefield and Kirklees and beyond the borough or Morley, so we can be conveniently ignored. Ardsley is quite definitely being asked to provide the lion's share of new housing without any benefit, it has poor services and has become a dormitory area of Leeds.

Name: Lisa Mulherin

Representor No: PRS05734

Representation ID: REP07126 Question Ref: H7

3372 East of Baghill Road - I support the Red designation of this site for the reasons set out in the consultation document.

Name: Karen Williams

Representor No: PRS06027

Representation ID: REP06857 Question Ref: H7

Sites 3372 (Assumed as 3373 stated) & 3373 B - Red Agree with coding (Assumed)

I believe the areas in question are the only green areas left in the area for children to play, people to walk thier dogs etc. Tingley is already overcrowded with schools so much so that local children are having to travel to schools further away. this is the last of the green belt area left in tingley/ardsley. We already have too much traffic for such a built up area.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3372

Housing

Baghill Road, West Ardsley, Morley

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Michael Green

Representor No: PRS00053

Representation ID: REP00459 Question Ref: H2

Oppose in current form - the boundaries between these sites and 3373B seem to have been drawn arbitrarily as straight lines, without regard to the features on the ground. As long, thin, single ended sites, questions arise as to the acceptability of such large numbers of houses off a single spine road.

Name: A Goddard

Representor No: PRS00108

Representation ID: REP00514 Question Ref: H1

Change suggested - Green to Red Reason for change - Local schools are oversubscribed and can not handle extra children in this area. Traffic congestion would increase also impacting on safety of children at Westerton Primary.

Name: Brian Guy

Representor No: PRS00142

Representation ID: REP04659 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Name: J Vaughan

Representor No: PRS00152

Representation ID: REP01822 Question Ref: H1

3373A - Green to red. There is already a large amount of new building in the area and already congested (and exceedingly badly maintained) roads, schools and other services cannot cope. As there seem to be hundreds of empty flats in the city centre, I question the necessity of so much more new housing!

Name: Katie Kerr

Representor No: PRS00163

Representation ID: REP01836 Question Ref: H1

3373A - Change from Green to Red. Increased housing means increased population increased traffic issues, school places? Reducing effectiveness of services available to public eg doctors.

Name: Paul Irwin

Representor No: PRS00164

Representation ID: REP01837 Question Ref: H1

3373A - Change from Green to Red. In Green Belt, Prime wildlife site. Green area for locals to enjoy.

Name: Christina Irwin

Representor No: PRS00165

Representation ID: REP01838 Question Ref: H1

3373A - Should be changed Green to Red. Valuable Green Belt Land. Haven for wildlife – Hedgehogs (already severely threatened species) Birds (many owls, sparrow Hawks & other birds) bats in summer months. Seen from lounge window! Plenty of brown belt land in Morley area. Schools totally full – waiting lists and appeals. Doctor's surgery not able to cope with current numbers let alone more new residents. Waiting 3 weeks to see preferred doctor!

Name: John Hill

Representor No: PRS00171

Representation ID: REP02097 Question Ref: H1

3373A - Green to red. More traffic on present Upper Green complex not acceptable. By 2016 present schools unable to take more children.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Philip Elson

Representor No: PRS00181

Representation ID: REP02107 Question Ref: H1

3373A - Green to red.

Damage to wood/wildlife, several protected species (bluebells/bats). This site needs changing to an area of protection.

Traffic congestion/lack of school/community facilities. Unless plans to build other schools/facilities local people will not be able to access local amenities.

Character of the area will be destroyed. Look to develop existing brown sites before destroying green spaces.

Name: Dianne Elson

Representor No: PRS00183

Representation ID: REP02110 Question Ref: H1

3373A - Green to red.

Damage to wood/wildlife, several protected species (bluebells/bats). This site needs changing to an area of protection.

Traffic congestion/lack of school/community facilities. Unless plans to build other schools/facilities, local people will not be able to access local amenities.

Character of the area will be destroyed. Look to develop existing brown sites before destroying green spaces.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Jill Butler

Representor No: PRS00189

Representation ID: REP06966 Question Ref: H1

3373a

[and assume 1336]

I wish to strongly object to proposed green belt sites adjacent and behind my house being released as suitable for building. The proposed sites are shown on Map 33 - 3373a. My house was only built 3 years ago and was bought specifically for the semi rural aspect views and the fact it is safe for children in a cul-de-sac with no thru traffic. I am extremely appalled and concerned that this proposal has been addressed without informing us at all. This will result in us having to move home that we have invested every penny in and worked so hard for and a loss in value of at least £50-75k. And will now make it very difficult to sell. I am absolutely disgusted and will do everything in my power to stop this happening. I will also be attending the town hall meeting and will be involving all local MPs.

Representation ID: REP02119 Question Ref: H1

3373A - Green to red. Existing agricultural land - there is a food shortage. Bats are residing adjacent and kestrels. Access from Upper Green Drive is unsuitable. Too narrow and will be a danger to small children who play in their current cul de sac. Not a through road.

Representation ID: REP02128 Question Ref: H1

3373A - Green to red.

Damage to surrounding protected wildlife - bats, kestrels and bluebells. Also known landfill and quarry in area, potential methane. Health hazard. Lack of infrastructure, schools full, doctors full, road parking already bad and too congested.

Representation ID: REP02645 Question Ref: H1

1336 +3373/3A (Assumes she means 3373A) Westerton Road/Haigh Woods. Red

This is greenbelt that is adjacent and back of my house directly. My house was built and brought only 2 years ago for the view and cul-de-sac position for my child we paid an additional £60K for this privacy. This site will ruin my property and our lives and cause safety issue with through traffic end of Upper Green Drive and rear.

Sites 3373/3A (assume she means 3373A) is a landfill area!

Syke Road Post Office to the right derelict houses and land needs development.

Representation ID: REP05704 Question Ref: H1

I would most definitely like to make a Comment.

I wish to strongly object to proposed green belt sites adjacent and behind my house being released as suitable for building.

My address is [x]

The proposed sites are shown on Map 33 - 3373a

My house was only built 3 years ago and was bought specifically for the semi rural aspect views and the fact it is safe for children in a cul-de-sac with no thru traffic.

I am extremely appalled and concerned that this proposal has been addressed without informing us at all. This will result in us having to move home that we have invested every penny in and worked so hard for and a loss in value of at least £50-75k. And will now make it very difficult to sell. I am absolutely disgusted and will do everything in my power to stop this happening. I will also be attending the town hall meeting and will be involving all local MPs.

Name: Richard Butler

Representor No: PRS00191

Representation ID: REP02129 Question Ref: H1

3373A - Green to red.

Damage to surrounding wildlife habitat - bats, kestrels, bluebells etc all protected. Used daily by walkers, families etc. will ruin locals quality of life. Not enough infrastructure, schools full, doctors full, parking already terrible at school times, roads can't cope.

Representation ID: REP02121 Question Ref: H1

3373A - Green to red. Existing agricultural, bats are residing and kestrels. Child safety issues from accessing via Upper Green Drive. Must not access from this area, currently a cul de sac and safe for children who play freely.

Representation ID: REP02862 Question Ref: H1

3373A and 1336. Tingley, Green to Red.

Greenbelt and loss of views etc. De value of property, safety issues with regards to children playing and currently a cul de sac.

Syke Road Post Office to the right derelict houses and site needs developing. GREEN.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Jacqueline Tate

Representor No: PRS00236

Representation ID: REP02170 Question Ref: H1

3373A - Green to red. Traffic along road. Disturbance to bats in the woods, schools full already and doctors too. The entrance to estate is very congested now without more houses.

Name: Sheree Haley

Representor No: PRS00241

Representation ID: REP02173 Question Ref: H1

3373A - Green to red. Bats are in this area. Additional housing will effect school's, doctor's and dentist which are already full. Traffic is very heavy in this area, additional housing will make congestion worse.

Name: M Haley

Representor No: PRS00243

Representation ID: REP02177 Question Ref: H1

3373A - Green to red. Additional housing will result in additional road congestion and will effect the local community services of doctors, dentists and schools as already struggling to cope with existing numbers. Bats and other wildlife would be effected by the proposed changes.

Name: Hayley Hey

Representor No: PRS00244

Representation ID: REP02178 Question Ref: H1

3373A - Green to red. Bats are in this area. Increased housing means increased traffic, population, school place issues, reducing effectiveness of services available and public eg. Doctors.

Name: Terence Butler

Representor No: PRS00245

Representation ID: REP02179 Question Ref: H1

3373A - Schools overpopulated. Access road, childrens safety

Name: E Thornton

Representor No: PRS00309

Representation ID: REP02250 Question Ref: H1

Damage to Haigh Wood and other trees. Wildlife affect and the wood helps the pollution in air.

Name: Wenda P Whitehead

Representor No: PRS00312

Representation ID: REP04786 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Name: L Puckett

Representor No: PRS00390

Representation ID: REP02333 Question Ref: H1

3373A - Green to red

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: G Puckett

Representor No: PRS00393

Representation ID: REP02334 Question Ref: H1

3373A - Green to Red
Schools, doctors, roads all full.
The site is good farmland.
Damage to trees and green land.
Area subject to too much development over the last 30 years.
Character of the area will change.

Name: Ann Williams

Representor No: PRS00407

Representation ID: REP02350 Question Ref: H1

3373A & 3373C Haigh Wood, West Ardsley - Green to Red
Damage to Haigh Wood and surrounding area - old historic site. Any more development would severely impact on this area in a detrimental way. This area needs protection not development due to flora and fauna of this area. Many bird species, bats, etc. A great number of people use this area for recreation and access to Haigh Moor Road and Batley Road. Access is required for Lee Fair, dating back to 1136 AD. (Surely no one can envisage the end of this oldest horse fair in the country).
The roads surrounding these sites are already clogged and there is a real danger of accidents to pedestrians due to the ongoing increase of traffic. My own address is almost inaccessible during term-time at Westerton School. Surrounding schools are already full and there is concern whether children reaching school age can even be accommodated in existing schools in the near future.
The whole community system would fail as Doctor's Surgeries, Dental Practices, etc are already turning people away because of the over population in this area.
We have a terrible public transport connection service and buses already have great trouble in negotiating Westerton and Skye roads at certain times of the day.
The suggested sites are well known undulating areas and this could prove difficult and costly to develop. There is also the mining and water wells to be considered.
Would the water supply be able to cope? The reservoir at Haigh Moor Road supplies this area.
If the trees (some of which are covered by a preservation order) are destroyed the area would lose all of its unique character and this would also impact on pollution levels.

Name: Janice Beever

Representor No: PRS00441

Representation ID: REP04791 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Name: John Williams

Representor No: PRS00475

Representation ID: REP02418 Question Ref: H1

3373A & 3373C Haigh Moor, Haigh Wood West Ardsley - Green to Red
We are already full!! Both public and private vehicles are clogging up on Westerton and Syke roads. Far more viable sites off Bradford Road or Thorpe Road.
Any further development would greatly and detrimentally impact on this historic and characterful area. Regards must be made to accommodate the oldest horse fair in the country (Lee Gap). The areas above provide well needed recreational space for walkers and cyclists and also access to Haigh Moor Road and Batley Road. Pollution would increase greatly if some of the natural habitat was disturbed as this is part of a site which is covered by a preservation order. There are numerous species of birds, plants, bats, and other creatures all native to this site.
Any development would impact on the scenery and views of residents in this area.
Our schools are at capacity already and any more vehicles in the area would give serious problems to the transport links and access to existing residential homes. We have limited shops in our area and not enough Doctor's surgeries or Dentists as it is! Where would all future children and adults go to school, doctors, dentists, etc.?
The site is very well documented as a mining area and consideration should be made to the water table in this area as there are wells and springs. Access would create major problems as the existing roads in our area were not designed for the existing amount of vehicles already trying to get from A to B.
I also have concerns regarding the pollution both from the lack of trees and the increase in traffic.
We have very poor public transport connections and a rise in buses would be totally unacceptable due to access at certain times.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: M Fleming

Representor No: PRS00680

Representation ID: REP02673 Question Ref: H1

3373A - Green to Red.

Name: E Dodds

Representor No: PRS00685

Representation ID: REP02680 Question Ref: H1

3373A- Green to red

Name: Alan Osborne

Representor No: PRS00751

Representation ID: REP02754 Question Ref: H1

[suggested change]3373A: green to red. Character of this area. The total number of proposals in this area does not "respect the character and objectives of local communities"

Representation ID: REP02754 Question Ref: H1

[suggested change]3373A: green to red. Character of this area. The total number of proposals in this area does not "respect the character and objectives of local communities"

Name: Judith Osborne

Representor No: PRS00756

Representation ID: REP02761 Question Ref: H1

3373A Green - Red. Scale of the proposed development detracting from the character of the area; impacting on the openness and out of character for the area. Inadequacy of local roads to cope with increased traffic and disruption to flow of traffic, especially around Westerton Road School. Impact on local wildlife currently inhabiting trees, hedgerows and green spaces

Name: A Godfrey

Representor No: PRS00852

Representation ID: REP02869 Question Ref: H1

3373A / 1336 -
Green to Red

Congestion

It now seems the norm that each house equates to two vehicles so the proposal of 205 houses means 410 additional cars.

We already experience severe traffic congestion at peak school times. From my observation the vast majority of parents bring their children to school in a car despite the fact that they live in the immediate locality.

The problems that this congestion brings, are dangerous and illegal parking with complete disregard to the safety of pedestrians and other road users. Cars are parked on corners at road junctions, on the pavement where passing with a pram is often impossible and parking already stretches down both Upper Green Way and Avenue. When challenged the drivers often become abusive. The police are aware of this situation and do appear to monitor it from time to time.

Schools

Can the local schools cope with all the additional pupils? Westerton School, Woodkirk School and Blackgates School have already been extended. Increased classroom sizes would have a detrimental effect on the teaching and learning of the children.

Lee Fair

Lee Fair has existed in this locality for hundreds of years and the locals are proud of its historical legacy. Would the Fair disappear completely or be moved away from the area. It would be very disappointing if this happened.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: P Godfrey

Representor No: PRS00854

Representation ID: REP02870 Question Ref: H1

3373A / 1336 -
Green to Red

Congestion

It now seems the norm that each house equates to two vehicles so the proposal of 205 houses means 410 additional cars.

We already experience severe traffic congestion at peak school times. From my observation the vast majority of parents bring their children to school in a car despite the fact that they live in the immediate locality.

The problems that this congestion brings, are dangerous and illegal parking with complete disregard to the safety of pedestrians and other road users. Cars are parked on corners at road junctions, on the pavement where passing with a pram is often impossible and parking already stretches down both Upper Green Way and Avenue. When challenged the drivers often become abusive. The police are aware of this situation and do appear to monitor it from time to time.

Schools

Can the local schools cope with all the additional pupils? Westerton School, Woodkirk School and Blackgates School have already been extended. Increased classroom sizes would have a detrimental effect on the teaching and learning of the children.

Lee Fair

Lee Fair has existed in this locality for hundreds of years and the locals are proud of its historical legacy. Would the Fair disappear completely or be moved away from the area. It would be very disappointing if this happened.

Name: Suzy Khalik

Representor No: PRS00892

Representation ID: REP02914 Question Ref: H1

3373A Bordering Upper Green Ave, Close, Drive, Way - Green to Red (Assumed)
Too much traffic already

Name: A Haley

Representor No: PRS00893

Representation ID: REP02915 Question Ref: H1

3373a Bordering Upper Green Close, Drive, Way - Green to Red (Assumed)

There will be too many cars, roads are already congested.

Bats may be disturbed in Woods area.

Strain on all services, doctors, schools etc.

Name: M Wadsworth

Representor No: PRS00895

Representation ID: REP02920 Question Ref: H1

3373A Haigh Well Green to Red.

Name: Sukhvinder Bhadal

Representor No: PRS00899

Representation ID: REP02923 Question Ref: H1

3373a Bordering Upper Green Avenue - Green to Red (Assumed)

Will increase traffic, endangering local children in area and families.

Name: Cynthia Samuel

Representor No: PRS00901

Representation ID: REP02926 Question Ref: H1

3373a Bordering Upper Green Avenue, Close, Drive and Way - Green to Red
Green Belt, inappropriate allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Michael White

Representor No: PRS00906

Representation ID: REP02932 Question Ref: H1

3373A - Bordering Upper Green Close, Way, Drive - Green to Red (Assumed)
Congestion on roads, doctors, etc.

Name: Angela Binns

Representor No: PRS00908

Representation ID: REP02935 Question Ref: H1

3373a Haigh Wood, Ardsley Green to Red (Assumed)
Too built up, let's leave a bit of countryside

Name: John Khalik

Representor No: PRS00909

Representation ID: REP02936 Question Ref: H1

3373a Bordering Upper Green Ave, Close, Drive and Way - Green to Red (Assumed)
Need to keep countryside - roads already congested

Name: R White

Representor No: PRS00910

Representation ID: REP02937 Question Ref: H1

3373a Bordering Upper Green Close, Way & Drive - Green to Red (Assumed)
Roads already congested at peak times.
Lack of provision of schools, doctors and dentists.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Anne Smith

Representor No: PRS00911

Representation ID: REP02938 Question Ref: H1

3373a Upper Green Avenue, Close and Way - Green to Red (Assumed)
Green Belt

Representation ID: REP04561 Question Ref: H1

3373A Haigh Wood, West Ardsley. Change from Green to Red. Site is in the Green Belt, maintain as a wildlife habitat. There is poor access to the site. Phasing

If it is decided that one or both of sites 3373A and 3373C are to be allocated then I request that they are phased for development in the later years of the plan. This would have twin benefits in allowing the recent growth in the area to be accommodated within the community and services to be established to support it, and would allow previously developed allocations and windfall sites to be developed first. Without that phasing the volume house builders in the market will inevitably take such greenfield sites forward as they are easier and so offer greater returns. This would not demonstrate the primacy of the plan-led system as required by Para 8.13.

Highway Capacity

An increase in housing in this area would only add to traffic problems along the A650 the A653 and other minor roads when there is an accident on the M62 when drivers try to find an alternative route.

Highway Safety

I note the intention to serve site 3373A by a single access point, being Upper Green Drive to Upper Green Avenue to meet Westerton Road opposite the primary school and then on via other routes to the main highway network. I cannot believe that a single access point is sufficient to service this number of properties, and cannot accept that the point at which it meets Westerton Road is appropriate.

Summary

I do not believe that the residential development of sites 3373A and 3373C would be sustainable development required by NPPF and so I ask that they be omitted from the Plan. If they are to be retained I request that they be phased to prevent development for a period of say 15 years to allow the community to become settled from recent growth, new services and employment opportunities to be developed and to allow the development of sequentially preferable brownfield sites elsewhere in the city.

I trust that these comments assist your consideration of the future housing allocations in this area. Please add my details to your consultation list so that I can be advised of any future consultation exercises of this nature.

Representation ID: REP04561 Question Ref: H11

Phasing

If it is decided that one or both of sites 3373A and 3373C are to be allocated then I request that they are phased for development in the later years of the plan. This would have twin benefits in allowing the recent growth in the area to be accommodated within the community and services to be established to support it, and would allow previously developed allocations and windfall sites to be developed first. Without that phasing the volume house builders in the market will inevitably take such greenfield sites forward as they are easier and so offer greater returns. This would not demonstrate the primacy of the plan-led system as required by Para 8.13.

Highway Capacity

An increase in housing in this area would only add to traffic problems along the A650 the A653 and other minor roads when there is an accident on the M62 when drivers try to find an alternative route.

Highway Safety

I note the intention to serve site 3373A by a single access point, being Upper Green Drive to Upper Green Avenue to meet Westerton Road opposite the primary school and then on via other routes to the main highway network. I cannot believe that a single access point is sufficient to service this number of properties, and cannot accept that the point at which it meets Westerton Road is appropriate.

Summary

I do not believe that the residential development of sites 3373A and 3373C would be sustainable development required by NPPF and so I ask that they be omitted from the Plan. If they are to be retained I request that they be phased to prevent development for a period of say 15 years to allow the community to become settled from recent growth, new services and employment opportunities to be developed and to allow the development of sequentially preferable brownfield sites elsewhere in the city.

Name: Maureen Jenkinson

Representor No: PRS00912

Representation ID: REP02939 Question Ref: H1

3373a - Haigh Wood, Ardsley - Green to Red (Assumed)

We need to keep our Green Belt!

Too overcrowded, ag, roads, schools, doctors

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: P S Barrie

Representor No: PRS00915

Representation ID: REP04769 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Representation ID: REP04810 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Representation ID: REP04781 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Representation ID: REP03109 Question Ref: H1

3373c Off Haigh Moor Road - Green to Red

Next to site of Haigh Wood. Would Mar an area of existing natural interest.

Again access would be via Haigh Moor Road

Congestion here with other proposed sites would be catastrophic for the residents in this area. Traffic would be too dense for the road network to handle

Schools and doctors full up in the area.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Jake Weatherhead

Representor No: PRS00948

Representation ID: REP02976 Question Ref: H1

3373a Upper Green, Tingley/3373c Upper Green Tingley/1336 Upper Green Tingley - Green to Red
SITE ALLOCATION CHANGES —SITE NUMBERS 3373A / 3373C / 1336

We are completely against the development of the above sites for a number of reasons, both personal and in the overall interest of the people living within Greater Morley.

- Access —Suggested access to the new sites through current 'Upper Green' roads would not be viable as road width/layout does not comply with planning requirements for a throughroad.

At present certain areas of the roads cannot accommodate two cars at the same time, more houses mean more traffic. This could lead to huge health and safety issues for motorists and pedestrians alike. Currently traffic on these roads are already at a high especially at peak times and the start and end of the school day (Westerton Primary is directly opposite upper green and is extremely busy at drop off and pick up times).

- Local framework —The local schools (both primary and secondary) are already full and have waiting lists for children already living in the area. Primary schools such as Westerton (already considered a large primary with 100 children per year group) is full with a considerable waiting list, Blackgates Primary has already been expanded to cope with the demand and has no further scope to expand even more. Secondary schools such as Woodkirk and Morley Academy are full with waiting lists. Leeds City Council are aware that there are not enough secondary school places available in this area for children already in the state school system and have granted authority to build a free school in Leeds City Centre(to open 01/09/14). With this in mind perhaps redevelopment of areas surrounding the City Centre or areas within the City Centre should be considered.

- Local Doctors surgeries are already full and continue to take on new patients.

Appointments are non-existent with most people having to go to drop in clinics to sit and wait (sometimes for up to 2 hours). This is hugely problematic for vulnerable patients (small children and the elderly) that sometimes require immediate attention. As for registering with a local NHS dentist— it's virtually impossible!

- Impact on environment. Planning permission stated that when our house was built (2008) the builders had to maintain the few trees between adjoining properties because of impact on the local environment and also to provide screening. Yet the same council with their new plans are happy to see the destruction of acres of protected trees and shrubs (Haigh Woods). This would have a huge impact on wildlife where we have a thriving bird population (which is currently in decline nationally) and a number of protected bats in the area. These birds and bats live/breed and feed in the zones currently highlighted for development. Tingley's green fields are already in decline, brownfield sites should be considered for redevelopment before we destroy our environment further. Planning permission for 20,000 houses have already been granted within the Leeds Area that haven't been built yet, surely these houses should be built and derelict areas redeveloped before we consider destroying green fields and wooded areas.

- The value of current properties will be greatly affected by the addition of housing on the sites stated. Currently Upper Green Drive is one of the most expensive streets for house prices in WF3, houses are built to a high standard and of similar size/value. When we purchased our house in 2008 we paid a premium rate which took into account not only the quality of the house but the area in which the house was situated (idyllic views of green fields and woods). The planned development would have a huge impact on property value and with most houses on the street having been newly built or recently purchased (valued according to the location/setting) there is a major concern that many families would face the possibility of negative equity. The current economic climate is already taking its toll on many families; this would further financially impact them.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Amy Weatherhead

Representor No: PRS00951

Representation ID: REP02990 Question Ref: H1

3373a Upper Green, Tingley/3373c Upper Green Tingley/1336 Upper Green Tingley - Green to Red
SITE ALLOCATION CHANGES —SITE NUMBERS 3373A / 3373C / 1336

We are completely against the development of the above sites for a number of reasons, both personal and in the overall interest of the people living within Greater Morley.

- Access —Suggested access to the new sites through current 'Upper Green' roads would not be viable as road width/layout does not comply with planning requirements for a throughroad.

At present certain areas of the roads cannot accommodate two cars at the same time, more houses mean more traffic. This could lead to huge health and safety issues for motorists and pedestrians alike. Currently traffic on these roads are already at a high especially at peak times and the start and end of the school day (Westerton Primary is directly opposite upper green and is extremely busy at drop off and pick up times).

- Local framework —The local schools (both primary and secondary) are already full and have waiting lists for children already living in the area. Primary schools such as Westerton (already considered a large primary with 100 children per year group) is full with a considerable waiting list, Blackgates Primary has already been expanded to cope with the demand and has no further scope to expand even more. Secondary schools such as Woodkirk and Morley Academy are full with waiting lists. Leeds City Council are aware that there are not enough secondary school places available in this area for children already in the state school system and have granted authority to build a free school in Leeds City Centre(to open 01/09/14). With this in mind perhaps redevelopment of areas surrounding the City Centre or areas within the City Centre should be considered.

- Local Doctors surgeries are already full and continue to take on new patients.

Appointments are non-existent with most people having to go to drop in clinics to sit and wait (sometimes for up to 2 hours). This is hugely problematic for vulnerable patients (small children and the elderly) that sometimes require immediate attention. As for registering with a local NHS dentist— it's virtually impossible!

- Impact on environment. Planning permission stated that when our house was built (2008) the builders had to maintain the few trees between adjoining properties because of impact on the local environment and also to provide screening. Yet the same council with their new plans are happy to see the destruction of acres of protected trees and shrubs (Haigh Woods). This would have a huge impact on wildlife where we have a thriving bird population (which is currently in decline nationally) and a number of protected bats in the area. These birds and bats live/breed and feed in the zones currently highlighted for development. Tingley's green fields are already in decline, brownfield sites should be considered for redevelopment before we destroy our environment further. Planning permission for 20,000 houses have already been granted within the Leeds Area that haven't been built yet, surely these houses should be built and derelict areas redeveloped before we consider destroying green fields and wooded areas.

- The value of current properties will be greatly affected by the addition of housing on the sites stated. Currently Upper Green Drive is one of the most expensive streets for house prices in WF3, houses are built to a high standard and of similar size/value. When we purchased our house in 2008 we paid a premium rate which took into account not only the quality of the house but the area in which the house was situated (idyllic views of green fields and woods). The planned development would have a huge impact on property value and with most houses on the street having been newly built or recently purchased (valued according to the location/setting) there is a major concern that many families would face the possibility of negative equity. The current economic climate is already taking its toll on many families; this would further financially impact them.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Andrew Weatherhead

Representor No: PRS00954

Representation ID: REP02993 Question Ref: H1

3373a Upper Green, Tingley/3373c Upper Green Tingley/1336 Upper Green Tingley - Green to Red
SITE ALLOCATION CHANGES —SITE NUMBERS 3373A / 3373C / 1336

We are completely against the development of the above sites for a number of reasons, both personal and in the overall interest of the people living within Greater Morley.

- Access —Suggested access to the new sites through current 'Upper Green' roads would not be viable as road width/layout does not comply with planning requirements for a throughroad.

At present certain areas of the roads cannot accommodate two cars at the same time, more houses mean more traffic. This could lead to huge health and safety issues for motorists and pedestrians alike. Currently traffic on these roads are already at a high especially at peak times and the start and end of the school day (Westerton Primary is directly opposite upper green and is extremely busy at drop off and pick up times).

- Local framework —The local schools (both primary and secondary) are already full and have waiting lists for children already living in the area. Primary schools such as Westerton (already considered a large primary with 100 children per year group) is full with a considerable waiting list, Blackgates Primary has already been expanded to cope with the demand and has no further scope to expand even more. Secondary schools such as Woodkirk and Morley Academy are full with waiting lists. Leeds City Council are aware that there are not enough secondary school places available in this area for children already in the state school system and have granted authority to build a free school in Leeds City Centre(to open 01/09/14). With this in mind perhaps redevelopment of areas surrounding the City Centre or areas within the City Centre should be considered.

- Local Doctors surgeries are already full and continue to take on new patients.

Appointments are non-existent with most people having to go to drop in clinics to sit and wait (sometimes for up to 2 hours). This is hugely problematic for vulnerable patients (small children and the elderly) that sometimes require immediate attention. As for registering with a local NHS dentist— it's virtually impossible!

- Impact on environment. Planning permission stated that when our house was built (2008) the builders had to maintain the few trees between adjoining properties because of impact on the local environment and also to provide screening. Yet the same council with their new plans are happy to see the destruction of acres of protected trees and shrubs (Haigh Woods). This would have a huge impact on wildlife where we have a thriving bird population (which is currently in decline nationally) and a number of protected bats in the area. These birds and bats live/breed and feed in the zones currently highlighted for development. Tingley's green fields are already in decline, brownfield sites should be considered for redevelopment before we destroy our environment further. Planning permission for 20,000 houses have already been granted within the Leeds Area that haven't been built yet, surely these houses should be built and derelict areas redeveloped before we consider destroying green fields and wooded areas.

- The value of current properties will be greatly affected by the addition of housing on the sites stated. Currently Upper Green Drive is one of the most expensive streets for house prices in WF3, houses are built to a high standard and of similar size/value. When we purchased our house in 2008 we paid a premium rate which took into account not only the quality of the house but the area in which the house was situated (idyllic views of green fields and woods). The planned development would have a huge impact on property value and with most houses on the street having been newly built or recently purchased (valued according to the location/setting) there is a major concern that many families would face the possibility of negative equity. The current economic climate is already taking its toll on many families; this would further financially impact them.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Kim Weatherhead

Representor No: PRS00956

Representation ID: REP02995 Question Ref: H1

3373a Upper Green, Tingley/3373c Upper Green Tingley/1336 Upper Green Tingley - Green to Red
SITE ALLOCATION CHANGES —SITE NUMBERS 3373A / 3373C / 1336

We are completely against the development of the above sites for a number of reasons, both personal and in the overall interest of the people living within Greater Morley.

- Access —Suggested access to the new sites through current 'Upper Green' roads would not be viable as road width/layout does not comply with planning requirements for a throughroad.

At present certain areas of the roads cannot accommodate two cars at the same time, more houses mean more traffic. This could lead to huge health and safety issues for motorists and pedestrians alike. Currently traffic on these roads are already at a high especially at peak times and the start and end of the school day (Westerton Primary is directly opposite upper green and is extremely busy at drop off and pick up times).

- Local framework —The local schools (both primary and secondary) are already full and have waiting lists for children already living in the area. Primary schools such as Westerton (already considered a large primary with 100 children per year group) is full with a considerable waiting list, Blackgates Primary has already been expanded to cope with the demand and has no further scope to expand even more. Secondary schools such as Woodkirk and Morley Academy are full with waiting lists. Leeds City Council are aware that there are not enough secondary school places available in this area for children already in the state school system and have granted authority to build a free school in Leeds City Centre(to open 01/09/14). With this in mind perhaps redevelopment of areas surrounding the City Centre or areas within the City Centre should be considered.

- Local Doctors surgeries are already full and continue to take on new patients.

Appointments are non-existent with most people having to go to drop in clinics to sit and wait (sometimes for up to 2 hours). This is hugely problematic for vulnerable patients (small children and the elderly) that sometimes require immediate attention. As for registering with a local NHS dentist— it's virtually impossible!

- Impact on environment. Planning permission stated that when our house was built (2008) the builders had to maintain the few trees between adjoining properties because of impact on the local environment and also to provide screening. Yet the same council with their new plans are happy to see the destruction of acres of protected trees and shrubs (Haigh Woods). This would have a huge impact on wildlife where we have a thriving bird population (which is currently in decline nationally) and a number of protected bats in the area. These birds and bats live/breed and feed in the zones currently highlighted for development. Tingley's green fields are already in decline, brownfield sites should be considered for redevelopment before we destroy our environment further. Planning permission for 20,000 houses have already been granted within the Leeds Area that haven't been built yet, surely these houses should be built and derelict areas redeveloped before we consider destroying green fields and wooded areas.

- The value of current properties will be greatly affected by the addition of housing on the sites stated. Currently Upper Green Drive is one of the most expensive streets for house prices in WF3, houses are built to a high standard and of similar size/value. When we purchased our house in 2008 we paid a premium rate which took into account not only the quality of the house but the area in which the house was situated (idyllic views of green fields and woods). The planned development would have a huge impact on property value and with most houses on the street having been newly built or recently purchased (valued according to the location/setting) there is a major concern that many families would face the possibility of negative equity. The current economic climate is already taking its toll on many families; this would further financially impact them.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: M Bunney

Representor No: PRS00957

Representation ID: REP02997 Question Ref: H1

3373a Upper Green, Tingley/3373c Upper Green Tingley/1336 Upper Green Tingley - Green to Red
SITE ALLOCATION CHANGES —SITE NUMBERS 3373A / 3373C / 1336

We are completely against the development of the above sites for a number of reasons, both personal and in the overall interest of the people living within Greater Morley.

- Access —Suggested access to the new sites through current 'Upper Green' roads would not be viable as road width/layout does not comply with planning requirements for a throughroad.

At present certain areas of the roads cannot accommodate two cars at the same time, more houses mean more traffic. This could lead to huge health and safety issues for motorists and pedestrians alike. Currently traffic on these roads are already at a high especially at peak times and the start and end of the school day (Westerton Primary is directly opposite upper green and is extremely busy at drop off and pick up times).

- Local framework —The local schools (both primary and secondary) are already full and have waiting lists for children already living in the area. Primary schools such as Westerton (already considered a large primary with 100 children per year group) is full with a considerable waiting list, Blackgates Primary has already been expanded to cope with the demand and has no further scope to expand even more. Secondary schools such as Woodkirk and Morley Academy are full with waiting lists. Leeds City Council are aware that there are not enough secondary school places available in this area for children already in the state school system and have granted authority to build a free school in Leeds City Centre(to open 01/09/14). With this in mind perhaps redevelopment of areas surrounding the City Centre or areas within the City Centre should be considered.

- Local Doctors surgeries are already full and continue to take on new patients.

Appointments are non-existent with most people having to go to drop in clinics to sit and wait (sometimes for up to 2 hours). This is hugely problematic for vulnerable patients (small children and the elderly) that sometimes require immediate attention. As for registering with a local NHS dentist— it's virtually impossible!

- Impact on environment. Planning permission stated that when our house was built (2008) the builders had to maintain the few trees between adjoining properties because of impact on the local environment and also to provide screening. Yet the same council with their new plans are happy to see the destruction of acres of protected trees and shrubs (Haigh Woods). This would have a huge impact on wildlife where we have a thriving bird population (which is currently in decline nationally) and a number of protected bats in the area. These birds and bats live/breed and feed in the zones currently highlighted for development. Tingley's green fields are already in decline, brownfield sites should be considered for redevelopment before we destroy our environment further. Planning permission for 20,000 houses have already been granted within the Leeds Area that haven't been built yet, surely these houses should be built and derelict areas redeveloped before we consider destroying green fields and wooded areas.

- The value of current properties will be greatly affected by the addition of housing on the sites stated. Currently Upper Green Drive is one of the most expensive streets for house prices in WF3, houses are built to a high standard and of similar size/value. When we purchased our house in 2008 we paid a premium rate which took into account not only the quality of the house but the area in which the house was situated (idyllic views of green fields and woods). The planned development would have a huge impact on property value and with most houses on the street having been newly built or recently purchased (valued according to the location/setting) there is a major concern that many families would face the possibility of negative equity. The current economic climate is already taking its toll on many families; this would further financially impact them.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Daniel Newsome

Representor No: PRS00958

Representation ID: REP02999 Question Ref: H1

3373a Upper Green, Tingley/3373c Upper Green Tingley/1336 Upper Green Tingley - Green to Red
SITE ALLOCATION CHANGES —SITE NUMBERS 3373A / 3373C / 1336

We are completely against the development of the above sites for a number of reasons, both personal and in the overall interest of the people living within Greater Morley.

- Access —Suggested access to the new sites through current 'Upper Green' roads would not be viable as road width/layout does not comply with planning requirements for a throughroad.

At present certain areas of the roads cannot accommodate two cars at the same time, more houses mean more traffic. This could lead to huge health and safety issues for motorists and pedestrians alike. Currently traffic on these roads are already at a high especially at peak times and the start and end of the school day (Westerton Primary is directly opposite upper green and is extremely busy at drop off and pick up times).

- Local framework —The local schools (both primary and secondary) are already full and have waiting lists for children already living in the area. Primary schools such as Westerton (already considered a large primary with 100 children per year group) is full with a considerable waiting list, Blackgates Primary has already been expanded to cope with the demand and has no further scope to expand even more. Secondary schools such as Woodkirk and Morley Academy are full with waiting lists. Leeds City Council are aware that there are not enough secondary school places available in this area for children already in the state school system and have granted authority to build a free school in Leeds City Centre(to open 01/09/14). With this in mind perhaps redevelopment of areas surrounding the City Centre or areas within the City Centre should be considered.

- Local Doctors surgeries are already full and continue to take on new patients.

Appointments are non-existent with most people having to go to drop in clinics to sit and wait (sometimes for up to 2 hours). This is hugely problematic for vulnerable patients (small children and the elderly) that sometimes require immediate attention. As for registering with a local NHS dentist— it's virtually impossible!

- Impact on environment. Planning permission stated that when our house was built (2008) the builders had to maintain the few trees between adjoining properties because of impact on the local environment and also to provide screening. Yet the same council with their new plans are happy to see the destruction of acres of protected trees and shrubs (Haigh Woods). This would have a huge impact on wildlife where we have a thriving bird population (which is currently in decline nationally) and a number of protected bats in the area. These birds and bats live/breed and feed in the zones currently highlighted for development. Tingley's green fields are already in decline, brownfield sites should be considered for redevelopment before we destroy our environment further. Planning permission for 20,000 houses have already been granted within the Leeds Area that haven't been built yet, surely these houses should be built and derelict areas redeveloped before we consider destroying green fields and wooded areas.

- The value of current properties will be greatly affected by the addition of housing on the sites stated. Currently Upper Green Drive is one of the most expensive streets for house prices in WF3, houses are built to a high standard and of similar size/value. When we purchased our house in 2008 we paid a premium rate which took into account not only the quality of the house but the area in which the house was situated (idyllic views of green fields and woods). The planned development would have a huge impact on property value and with most houses on the street having been newly built or recently purchased (valued according to the location/setting) there is a major concern that many families would face the possibility of negative equity. The current economic climate is already taking its toll on many families; this would further financially impact them.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Tom Newsome

Representor No: PRS00960

Representation ID: REP03000 Question Ref: H1

3373a Upper Green, Tingley/3373c Upper Green Tingley/1336 Upper Green Tingley - Green to Red
SITE ALLOCATION CHANGES —SITE NUMBERS 3373A / 3373C / 1336

We are completely against the development of the above sites for a number of reasons, both personal and in the overall interest of the people living within Greater Morley.

- Access —Suggested access to the new sites through current 'Upper Green' roads would not be viable as road width/layout does not comply with planning requirements for a throughroad.

At present certain areas of the roads cannot accommodate two cars at the same time, more houses mean more traffic. This could lead to huge health and safety issues for motorists and pedestrians alike. Currently traffic on these roads are already at a high especially at peak times and the start and end of the school day (Westerton Primary is directly opposite upper green and is extremely busy at drop off and pick up times).

- Local framework —The local schools (both primary and secondary) are already full and have waiting lists for children already living in the area. Primary schools such as Westerton (already considered a large primary with 100 children per year group) is full with a considerable waiting list, Blackgates Primary has already been expanded to cope with the demand and has no further scope to expand even more. Secondary schools such as Woodkirk and Morley Academy are full with waiting lists. Leeds City Council are aware that there are not enough secondary school places available in this area for children already in the state school system and have granted authority to build a free school in Leeds City Centre(to open 01/09/14). With this in mind perhaps redevelopment of areas surrounding the City Centre or areas within the City Centre should be considered.

- Local Doctors surgeries are already full and continue to take on new patients.

Appointments are non-existent with most people having to go to drop in clinics to sit and wait (sometimes for up to 2 hours). This is hugely problematic for vulnerable patients (small children and the elderly) that sometimes require immediate attention. As for registering with a local NHS dentist— it's virtually impossible!

- Impact on environment. Planning permission stated that when our house was built (2008) the builders had to maintain the few trees between adjoining properties because of impact on the local environment and also to provide screening. Yet the same council with their new plans are happy to see the destruction of acres of protected trees and shrubs (Haigh Woods). This would have a huge impact on wildlife where we have a thriving bird population (which is currently in decline nationally) and a number of protected bats in the area. These birds and bats live/breed and feed in the zones currently highlighted for development. Tingley's green fields are already in decline, brownfield sites should be considered for redevelopment before we destroy our environment further. Planning permission for 20,000 houses have already been granted within the Leeds Area that haven't been built yet, surely these houses should be built and derelict areas redeveloped before we consider destroying green fields and wooded areas.

- The value of current properties will be greatly affected by the addition of housing on the sites stated. Currently Upper Green Drive is one of the most expensive streets for house prices in WF3, houses are built to a high standard and of similar size/value. When we purchased our house in 2008 we paid a premium rate which took into account not only the quality of the house but the area in which the house was situated (idyllic views of green fields and woods). The planned development would have a huge impact on property value and with most houses on the street having been newly built or recently purchased (valued according to the location/setting) there is a major concern that many families would face the possibility of negative equity. The current economic climate is already taking its toll on many families; this would further financially impact them.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: J Newsome

Representor No: PRS00961

Representation ID: REP03002 Question Ref: H1

3373a Upper Green, Tingley/3373c Upper Green Tingley/1336 Upper Green Tingley - Green to Red
SITE ALLOCATION CHANGES —SITE NUMBERS 3373A / 3373C / 1336

We are completely against the development of the above sites for a number of reasons, both personal and in the overall interest of the people living within Greater Morley.

- Access —Suggested access to the new sites through current 'Upper Green' roads would not be viable as road width/layout does not comply with planning requirements for a throughroad.

At present certain areas of the roads cannot accommodate two cars at the same time, more houses mean more traffic. This could lead to huge health and safety issues for motorists and pedestrians alike. Currently traffic on these roads are already at a high especially at peak times and the start and end of the school day (Westerton Primary is directly opposite upper green and is extremely busy at drop off and pick up times).

- Local framework —The local schools (both primary and secondary) are already full and have waiting lists for children already living in the area. Primary schools such as Westerton (already considered a large primary with 100 children per year group) is full with a considerable waiting list, Blackgates Primary has already been expanded to cope with the demand and has no further scope to expand even more. Secondary schools such as Woodkirk and Morley Academy are full with waiting lists. Leeds City Council are aware that there are not enough secondary school places available in this area for children already in the state school system and have granted authority to build a free school in Leeds City Centre(to open 01/09/14). With this in mind perhaps redevelopment of areas surrounding the City Centre or areas within the City Centre should be considered.

- Local Doctors surgeries are already full and continue to take on new patients.

Appointments are non-existent with most people having to go to drop in clinics to sit and wait (sometimes for up to 2 hours). This is hugely problematic for vulnerable patients (small children and the elderly) that sometimes require immediate attention. As for registering with a local NHS dentist— it's virtually impossible!

- Impact on environment. Planning permission stated that when our house was built (2008) the builders had to maintain the few trees between adjoining properties because of impact on the local environment and also to provide screening. Yet the same council with their new plans are happy to see the destruction of acres of protected trees and shrubs (Haigh Woods). This would have a huge impact on wildlife where we have a thriving bird population (which is currently in decline nationally) and a number of protected bats in the area. These birds and bats live/breed and feed in the zones currently highlighted for development. Tingley's green fields are already in decline, brownfield sites should be considered for redevelopment before we destroy our environment further. Planning permission for 20,000 houses have already been granted within the Leeds Area that haven't been built yet, surely these houses should be built and derelict areas redeveloped before we consider destroying green fields and wooded areas.

- The value of current properties will be greatly affected by the addition of housing on the sites stated. Currently Upper Green Drive is one of the most expensive streets for house prices in WF3, houses are built to a high standard and of similar size/value. When we purchased our house in 2008 we paid a premium rate which took into account not only the quality of the house but the area in which the house was situated (idyllic views of green fields and woods). The planned development would have a huge impact on property value and with most houses on the street having been newly built or recently purchased (valued according to the location/setting) there is a major concern that many families would face the possibility of negative equity. The current economic climate is already taking its toll on many families; this would further financially impact them.

Name: Amy Weldon

Representor No: PRS00980

Representation ID: REP03023 Question Ref: H1

1336 (Assumed 3373A & 3373C) Haigh Wood - Green to Red
Woodland site
Wildlife loss, biodiversity

Name: S Fothergill

Representor No: PRS00984

Representation ID: REP03028 Question Ref: H1

3373a Haigh Wood - Green to Red (Assumed)

Leave as Green Belt. Should be left as a wood. This site is a walking area and play area for children. Too many of these spaces have been developed.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: David Ian Sanderson

Representor No: PRS01000

Representation ID: REP03038 Question Ref: H1

3373A Tingley - Green to Red

Name: David Eyles

Representor No: PRS01002

Representation ID: REP03049 Question Ref: H1

3373A

Representation ID: REP03049 Question Ref: H1

1330b, 3373a Tingley - Green to Red

Surface water, flooding, ecological implications (bats and newts), damage to habitats (bats in fields).

Out of character with area.

Name: S Milner

Representor No: PRS01004

Representation ID: REP03053 Question Ref: H1

3373a Tingley - Green to Red

No change should be made. This site would cause pressure on the schools. The access roads are impassable at school times now. Another 130 homes would make this worse.

Name: Fran Mcknight

Representor No: PRS01009

Representation ID: REP03060 Question Ref: H1

1330b, 1336, 3373a - Green to Red

Extra traffic will cause a danger to children playing .

Drainage in area is already poor.

Endangering wildlife.

Schools becoming overcrowded.

Out of character with area.

Name: Anne Milner

Representor No: PRS01016

Representation ID: REP03070 Question Ref: H1

1330b, 3373a Tingley - Green to Red

Surface water, flooding.

Wildlife, bats, newts. Nature and grassland habitats

The Upper Green cul de sac is not suitable to serve up to 130 more houses. Severe dangers at school times.

Changes to landscape.

Primary and secondary schools are already full and difficult to expand further.

Name: Lynne Watson

Representor No: PRS01020

Representation ID: REP03075 Question Ref: H1

1330b, 1336, 3373a - Green to Red

Current drainage in the area is not sufficient, causing flooding in Westerton Road. Further housing development will exacerbate the problem.

Extra traffic will be created by this development as the current bus services are insufficient .

The proposed site will decimate a natural environment for small mammals, birds and other wildlife.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Andrew Davey

Representor No: PRS01030

Representation ID: REP03088 Question Ref: H1

3373a Tingley - Green to Red

Cul de sac not suitable.

Could create hazards during school times.

Out of character with the area.

Name: Simon Mcknight

Representor No: PRS01032

Representation ID: REP03091 Question Ref: H1

1330b, 1336, 3373a Green to Red

Damage to fields, bats in the field, poor drainage, danger to local wildlife. Out of character with area.

Name: Jedson Swallow

Representor No: PRS01040

Representation ID: REP03097 Question Ref: H1

3373a Tingley - Green to Red

Cul de sac not suitable for the amount of houses - a danger at school times.

It's already hard getting children in school in the area due to over population.

Name: Jean Dawson

Representor No: PRS01045

Representation ID: REP03103 Question Ref: H1

3373a Westerton Road Upper Green - Green to Red

Green belt site

Spoiling the environment - we have bats and a lot of lovely birds

Name: A Longfellow

Representor No: PRS01060

Representation ID: REP03123 Question Ref: H1

3373A Tingley - Green to Red

Name: M Mccleave

Representor No: PRS01126

Representation ID: REP03201 Question Ref: H1

3373A & C - Green to Red

The site would cause pressure on the schools. The access roads are impassable at school times.

Not enough doctors, dentists, schools to accommodate.

Name: G Fothergill

Representor No: PRS01131

Representation ID: REP03204 Question Ref: H1

3373a Haigh Wood - Green to Red (Assumed)

Green belt land - always has been

This has been a wood for lots to walk and children to play.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Michael Stilwell

Representor No: PRS01133

Representation ID: REP03207 Question Ref: H1

3373A
Lack of amenities – the amenities in the area cannot support the existing population of West Ardsley, never mind accepting an influx of possibly 5000 more.
- Virtually all the shops have closed over the years, there are now only 3 grocery shops in the area. Anyone living at the southern end of Haigh Moor Road has over 1 mile to travel to the nearest shop.
- The schools are overcrowded, Westerton Road has had more external classrooms added, so it cannot be extended. Hill Top School is nearly full now from the existing population growth, again it is extremely limited in expansion possibilities.
- Bus services are pathetic, services to Leeds, Dewsbury and Wakefield are hourly at best. Batley is only accessible from Wakefield –Batley Road. There are areas where buses have been removed completely. This week another service has been stopped.
- There are not any play areas for children, your own survey records this failing.
- There is only one medical centre with 8 doctors giving cover to some existing 15000 patients. To get an appointment with a specific GP can take 3 weeks, the centre has recently been extended to its limits so there is nowhere to go. Also there is only one pharmacist.

Traffic
All the roads in the area are in a bad state of repair, I have lived here for 28 years and Haigh Moor Road has never been resurfaced despite 3 new housing estates accessing it. In June 1992 the planning inspector denied a planning application (91/23/00350) for an annex for an invalid because although neither he nor his brother drove. The reason for this was “I am concerned that were an additional dwelling to be provided there would be no guarantee that it would not lead to additional traffic generation at some future time, perhaps through changed circumstances, with consequent adverse impact on highway safety.” Yet here we are with a further 70 houses at Foxfields and Jude's Pond and a proposed 179 on these new sites, probably adding in excess of 500 vehicles to Haigh Moor Road.

There has been a water leak on HMR which despite being reported to Yorkshire Water is still flowing after 3 months and has now become 2 leaks. The western end of Westerton Road is in a dangerous state with potholes and speed restriction bumps. LCC appears to be unable to keep up with the maintenance of its roads in South Leeds.

LCC's attitude to this area seems to be that Ardsley is an outpost on the borders with Wakefield and Kirklees and beyond the borough or Morley, so we can be conveniently ignored. Ardsley is quite definitely being asked to provide the lion's share of new housing without any benefit, it has poor services and has become a dormitory area of Leeds.

Name: M Ward

Representor No: PRS01164

Representation ID: REP03261 Question Ref: General comment

Map 33 [Assume this refers to the UDP proposals map 33] - no site specified.
I want to object to any building on this site. This will affect wild life and cause overcrowding in our local schools. It will increase traffic in the area and our children will suffer from having no green land or woods to play and have fun in the future.

Name: Lynne Paul

Representor No: PRS01169

Representation ID: REP04800 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Name: D Paul

Representor No: PRS01183

Representation ID: REP04793 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Name: R Finnigan

Representor No: PRS01187

Representation ID: REP03285 Question Ref: H1

3373A Green to Red. Housing demand can be served by using the 21,000 planning permissions already granted and not yet built and returning the 12,000 empty homes in Leeds back into circulation. Brownfield sites to be used up before use of green filed sites. I wish to make representation at public communication.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Rita Sykes

Representor No: PRS01432

Representation ID: REP03560 Question Ref: H1

3373A -Is it proposed that this site should link up with site 3373c by the construction of through roads? If this is the case , I would have even more serious concerns of the effect on local traffic and believe that the highways Dept should be concerned about suitable access and road safety issues.

Name: James Pow

Representor No: PRS01505

Representation ID: REP03644 Question Ref: H1

3373A Green TO RED, We oppose the development of the above sites for the following reasons;

1. The current roads on the upper Green estate will not be able to cope with an increase in traffic. In particular, the junction of the upper green way and upper green drive is already very dangerous. Cars tend to have to use the middle of the road to get around the corner and people who live on the immediate estate are aware they have to slow down and be mindful of oncoming cars and children playing in the proximity. An increase in traffic is highly likely to cause a serious accident on this bend. The junction of Westerton Road and upper green way already come to a complete standstill at the start and end of the school day.
2. Primary schools and high schools in the area oversubscribed and have waiting lists. Westerton primary school is the nearest school to the propose3d development and is the largest primary school in Leeds.
3. The field's on the proposed development are currently used to grow crops for food. The woodland area is used by the local people for recreation.
4. The destruction of protected trees and shrubs would have a negative effect on wildlife.
5. The local healthcare facilities are currently at full capacity.
6. There is little employment within walking distance from the proposed development.

We consider that additional housing should not be built on greenbelt land. Instead brownfield sites should be used where wildlife, agricultural land and woodland would not be affected and the infrastructure would be more suitable.

Name: B Stringer

Representor No: PRS01606

Representation ID: REP04797 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Name: L.e Beever

Representor No: PRS01607

Representation ID: REP04804 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Tim Chapman

Representor No: PRS01644

Representation ID: REP03799 Question Ref: H1

3373A -

I am making my response by letter; the online boxes rejected my comments because they exceed 3,000 digits.

3373A Haigh Wood, West Ardsley, 3373C Haigh Wood, West Ardsley, 1336 Westerton Road, West Ardsley, 3456A Ardsley Reservoir, 1258 Westerton Road, Tingley, 3365 Westerton Road, Tingley, 1032 Bradford Road, 1143B & 1143D Thorpe Lane, Tingley.

Objections.

The Core Strategy seeks to be "fair". The word is used in paragraph 1.2 and again in 1.14. Yet the proposed green housing sites when taken together would definitely not be fair to West Ardsley and Tingley. No justification has been given as to why there is such a concentration here, nor any evidence of local need. Indeed, paragraph 4.6.14 states that "The SHMA 2011 was not able to identify any geographically specific need for new housing based on population growth." The 13 green housing sites in Ardsley and Tingley seem to have been assessed individually rather than their cumulative impact. This impact is potentially very much greater when considered alongside Kirklees Council's proposals for the Chidswell area, and comes on top of the huge impact on West Ardsley of major housing development in the 1990s - the estates now accessed by Lowry Road and Constable Road. The newly proposed sites taken together would consolidate semi-rural groups of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area. Most of the open frontages to Bradford Road and Westerton Road would be built on, removing open aspects and distant views and tending towards the creation of amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the length of the A650.

Site 3373A. Additional objections

1. Local character and identity

Development of this site would be contrary to the following sections of the Council's policy SP1 in the Core Strategy:

SP1 (i) states: "Smaller Settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlement's size, function and sustainability."

Site 3373A, with its estimated capacity of 130 dwellings, does not have regard to the size, function and sustainability of West Ardsley.

SP1 (iii) states: "For development to respect and enhance the local character and identity of places and neighbourhoods". The local character and identity of West Ardsley would be seriously threatened by 3373A, especially when combined with sites 3373C and 1336, and would make its component areas of Upper Green, Haigh Moor and Hill Top barely distinguishable from each other.

Three letters from the Planning Inspectorate were used in the Council's own evidence to the Unitary Development Plan public inquiry in 1995. In paragraph 39 of his report on the Morley Local Plan, the inspector considered that the planned development at Haigh Wood (site WA2H) would have a "very serious impact upon the character and environment of West Ardsley". He concluded in paragraph 10: "In the past, development in the Morley area would appear to have been sporadic and opportunist, placing the identity of the smaller settlements at risk and tending towards the creation of amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the length of the A650 Bradford to Wakefield road. In my view, the further diffusion of the existing loosely-knit settlement pattern should, as far as possible, be resisted."

Considering appeals in 1986 on 81/23/00212 and 81/23/00213 (broadly the same area as LDF sites 3373A/B/C and 1336) the inspector said "It would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This was endorsed in the Secretary of State's decision letter.

In 1994, a third inspector dismissed an appeal to develop land at Arthington Close near the edge of Haigh Wood because it would "unacceptably erode the fringe of this rural area and would lead to pressure for further encroachment of residential development, most particularly in the fields to the west...".

Although some years have passed since these decisions, the character and environment of the area are still semi-rural and just as delicate. When cogent arguments have been repeatedly made against development of the 3373 areas by the Secretary of State, by three planning inspectors and by Leeds Council itself (in evidence to the UDP inquiry), there can be no justification for sites 3373A, 3373C and 1336 being pursued for residential development in the LDF. They should instead be reclassified as "red" and withdrawn from consideration for development when producing the next stage of the plan.

2. Damage to Haigh Wood and Baghill Beck valley

Development of this site would be contrary to the Council's policy P12 in the Core Strategy:

"The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes, including their historical and cultural significance, will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness through stewardship and the planning process." The secluded Haigh Wood valley comprises the central portion of site 3373A, including part of the wood covered by a Tree Preservation Order. Residential development would prejudice the objectives underlining this policy as set out in paragraphs 5.3.46 to 5.3.48 of the Core Strategy including: "The Council seeks to protect and enhance the varied landscapes of Leeds and the assets they contain, from valued local trees, the countryside to nationally designated landscape, fauna and flora".

This view was endorsed by three planning inspectors and again in the Council's evidence, given by Mr G B Andrews, at the UDP inquiry. In his paragraph 4.3.6, Mr Andrews stated: I refer to the conclusions reached by the inspectors at the two subsequent appeal cases in 1985 and 1994. In each case it is acknowledged that the Haigh Wood area is of value as an area of attractive open farmland with a rural character and provides an important amenity in the local area". Even the Council's own assessment for the LDF states that the site is: "Not supported (RED). This site includes Haigh Wood and Baghill Beck Local Nature Area which fall under UK Biological Action Plan priority habitats - a mixture of woodland, scrub and grassland

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Tim Chapman

Representor No: PRS01644

habitats alongside Baghill Beck. There are a number of wide hedgerow/woodland belts throughout the site that provide a valuable habitat. Water vole has been recorded on the Hey Beck. The Baghill Beck flows into this water course and could support this species. Bats to consider."

3. Highway access. The Upper Green culs-de-sac are not designed or suitable to serve up to 130 more houses. They would become much less safe for children to play in and the already severe dangers at school times would be exacerbated.

4. Schools. Primary and secondary schools already full and difficult to expand further.

5. Agricultural land. Good quality agricultural land would be lost.

6. Viability. Extra costs from: a. parts of 3373A have serious levels problems and look undevelopable; b. bell pits known to exist in the area from former mining; c. elimination of Japanese Knotweed.

Representation ID: REP05648 Question Ref: H1

Local Development Framework, Site Allocations Plan, Public Consultation.

I am making my response by letter; the online boxes rejected my comments because they exceed 3,000 digits.

3373A Haigh Wood, West Ardsley, 3373C Haigh Wood, West Ardsley,
1336 Westerton Road, West Ardsley, 3456A Ardsley Reservoir,
1258 Westerton Road, Tingley, 3365 Westerton Road, Tingley,
1032 Bradford Road, 1143B & 1143D Thorpe Lane, Tingley.
Objections.

The Core Strategy seeks to be "fair". The word is used in paragraph 1.2 and again in 1.14. Yet the proposed green housing sites when taken together would definitely not be fair to West Ardsley and Tingley. No justification has been given as to why there is such a concentration here, nor any evidence of local need. Indeed, paragraph 4.6.14 states that "The SHMA 2011 was not able to identify any geographically specific need for new housing based on population growth." The 13 green housing sites in Ardsley and Tingley seem to have been assessed individually rather than their cumulative impact. This impact is potentially very much greater when considered alongside Kirklees Council's proposals for the Chidswell area, and comes on top of the huge impact on West Ardsley of major housing development in the 1990s - the estates now accessed by Lowry Road and Constable Road. The newly proposed sites taken together would consolidate semi-rural groups of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area. Most of the open frontages to Bradford Road and Westerton Road would be built on, removing open aspects and distant views and tending towards the creation of amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the length of the A650.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Tim Chapman

Representor No: PRS01644

Representation ID: REP05648 Question Ref: H1

Local Development Framework, Site Allocations Plan, Public Consultation.

I am making my response by letter; the online boxes rejected my comments because they exceed 3,000 digits.

3373A Haigh Wood, West Ardsley, 3373C Haigh Wood, West Ardsley,
1336 Westerton Road, West Ardsley, 3456A Ardsley Reservoir,
1258 Westerton Road, Tingley, 3365 Westerton Road, Tingley,
1032 Bradford Road, 1143B & 1143D Thorpe Lane, Tingley.
Objections.

The Core Strategy seeks to be "fair". The word is used in paragraph 1.2 and again in 1.14. Yet the proposed green housing sites when taken together would definitely not be fair to West Ardsley and Tingley. No justification has been given as to why there is such a concentration here, nor any evidence of local need. Indeed, paragraph 4.6.14 states that "The SHMA 2011 was not able to identify any geographically specific need for new housing based on population growth." The 13 green housing sites in Ardsley and Tingley seem to have been assessed individually rather than their cumulative impact. This impact is potentially very much greater when considered alongside Kirklees Council's proposals for the Chidswell area, and comes on top of the huge impact on West Ardsley of major housing development in the 1990s - the estates now accessed by Lowry Road and Constable Road. The newly proposed sites taken together would consolidate semi-rural groups of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area. Most of the open frontages to Bradford Road and Westerton Road would be built on, removing open aspects and distant views and tending towards the creation of amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the length of the A650.

Site 3373A. Additional objections

1. Local character and identity

Development of this site would be contrary to the following sections of the Council's policy SP1 in the Core Strategy:

SP1 (i) states: "Smaller Settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlement's size, function and sustainability."

Site 3373A, with its estimated capacity of 130 dwellings, does not have regard to the size, function and sustainability of West Ardsley.

SP1 (iii) states: "For development to respect and enhance the local character and identity of places and neighbourhoods". The local character and identity of West Ardsley would be seriously threatened by 3373A, especially when combined with sites 3373C and 1336, and would make its component areas of Upper Green, Haigh Moor and Hill Top barely distinguishable from each other.

Three letters from the Planning Inspectorate were used in the Council's own evidence to the Unitary Development Plan public inquiry in 1995. In paragraph 39 of his report on the Morley Local Plan, the inspector considered that the planned development at Haigh Wood (site WA2H) would have a "very serious impact upon the character and environment of West Ardsley". He concluded in paragraph 10: "In the past, development in the Morley area would appear to have been sporadic and opportunist, placing the identity of the smaller settlements at risk and tending towards the creation of amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the length of the A650 Bradford to Wakefield road. In my view, the further diffusion of the existing loosely-knit settlement pattern should, as far as possible, be resisted."

Considering appeals in 1986 on 81/23/00212 and 81/23/00213 (broadly the same area as LDF sites 3373A/B/C and 1336) the inspector said "It would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This was endorsed in the Secretary of State's decision letter.

In 1994, a third inspector dismissed an appeal to develop land at Arthington Close near the edge of Haigh Wood because it would "unacceptably erode the fringe of this rural area and would lead to pressure for further encroachment of residential development, most particularly in the fields to the west...".

Although some years have passed since these decisions, the character and environment of the area are still semi-rural and just as delicate.

When cogent arguments have been repeatedly made against development of the 3373 areas by the Secretary of State, by three planning inspectors and by Leeds Council itself (in evidence to the UDP inquiry), there can be no justification for sites 3373A, 3373C and 1336 being pursued for residential development in the LDF. They should instead be reclassified as "red" and withdrawn from consideration for development when producing the next stage of the plan.

2. Damage to Haigh Wood and Baghill Beck valley

Development of this site would be contrary to the Council's policy P12 in the Core Strategy:

"The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes, including their historical and cultural significance, will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness through stewardship and the planning process." The secluded Haigh Wood valley comprises the central portion of site 3373A, including part of the wood covered by a Tree Preservation Order. Residential development would prejudice the objectives underlining this policy as set out in paragraphs 5.3.46 to 5.3.48 of the Core Strategy including: "The Council seeks to protect and enhance the varied landscapes of Leeds and the assets they contain, from valued local trees, the countryside to nationally designated landscape, fauna and flora".

This view was endorsed by three planning inspectors and again in the Council's evidence, given by Mr G B Andrews, at the UDP inquiry. In his paragraph 4.3.6, Mr Andrews stated: I refer to the conclusions reached by the inspectors at the two subsequent appeal cases in 1985 and 1994. In each case it is acknowledged that the Haigh Wood area is of value as an area of attractive open farmland with a rural character and provides an important amenity in the local area". Even the Council's own assessment for the LDF states that the site is: "Not supported (RED). This site includes Haigh Wood and Baghill Beck Local Nature Area which fall under UK Biological Action Plan priority habitats - a mixture of woodland, scrub and grassland habitats alongside Baghill Beck. There are a number of wide hedgerow/woodland belts throughout the site that provide a valuable habitat. Water vole has been recorded on the Hey Beck. The Baghill Beck flows into this water course and could support this species. Bats to consider."

3. Highway access. The Upper Green culs-de-sac are not designed or suitable to serve up to 130 more houses. They would become much less safe for children to play in and the already severe dangers at school times would be exacerbated.

4. Schools. Primary and secondary schools already full and difficult to expand further.

5. Agricultural land. Good quality agricultural land would be lost.

6. Viability. Extra costs from: a. parts of 3373A have serious levels problems and look undevelopable; b. bell pits known to exist in the area from former mining; c. elimination of Japanese Knotweed.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: S Hunter

Representor No: PRS01911

Representation ID: REP06974 Question Ref: H1

3373A & 3373C - Green to Red

We object for the following reasons:

We live only 320 metres from Hill Top School, having moved here in November 2010 we have been unable to place our now 7 year old son at the school due to it being full. We have been at the top of the waiting list for several terms, but have been unable to get him into the school. We have also been unable to get our son into Westerton primary the 2nd nearest primary school. The only school that can be offered are poor performing schools out of the area. Where are additional families going to send their children to school - out of the area, driving them to school and increasing traffic! Access via Hill Top Lane will lead to a significant increase in traffic, the reason for moving to this area was to be away from traffic and to live somewhere where it is safe for children to play. Making Hill Top Lane a through road would not be safe for young children.

At the junction at the end of Hill Top Lane it is already extremely difficult to turn right onto Batley Road, this is due to Batley Road already carrying heavy traffic, there is a blind corner and hill to the right and there are always cars parked opposite the junction meaning that you have to drive on the wrong side of the road round a corner meeting the brow of a hill.

Turning right out of Hill Top Grove onto Hill Top Lane has very poor visibility due to a large tree, increased traffic will cause difficulty in safely turning right onto Hill Top Lane. West Ardsley is a sleepy village with very little other than housing and woodland in the area. People live here in order to enjoy the surrounding countryside and woodland and the wildlife it has to offer. Not only will building in the area destroy the enjoyment residents have in the countryside and wildlife, but as there is so little in the area to do i.e. Healthcare, Shops, Parks, Fitness, Children's Entertainment, any new houses would lead to increased traffic as residents have to drive to find these things.

As an example our closest doctors surgery is at East Ardsley 2 miles drive from our home. To book an appointment, there is generally a 2 week wait just to get a routine appointment. What is proposed to cope with the additional demand on doctors surgeries and health services or will we now need to wait several more weeks just to get a routine appointment?

The wildlife in the area is quite special, we regularly have Jays visiting our garden, quite rare for these shy birds. There are many, many different species of birds in the areas, hedgehogs, foxes, what is proposed to protect these creatures?

In summary the residents of West Ardsley live here purely to enjoy wildlife, countryside, lack of traffic and tolerate the fact that they must travel out of the area for everything including for ourselves a school! To remove the wildlife, countryside and increase traffic and number of residents WOULD RUIN THIS AREA AND THE LIVES OF THE RESIDENTS!

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: S Hunter

Representor No: PRS01911

Representation ID: REP04087 Question Ref: H1

3373A / 3373C -

We are disgusted that as residents who live directly adjacent to 3373C we received no notification of these proposals and it was down to a neighbour who called at our house yesterday to make us aware and also that the closing date for submitting comments is Monday 29th July!

We object for the following reasons:

We live only 320 metres from Hill Top School, having moved here in November 2010 we have been unable to place our now 7 year old son at the school due to it being full. We have been at the top of the waiting list for several terms, but have been unable to get him into the school. We have also been unable to get our son into Westerton primary the 2nd nearest primary school. The only school that can be offered are poor performing schools out of the area. Where are additional families going to send their children to school - out of the area, driving them to school and increasing traffic!

Access via Hill Top Lane will lead to a significant increase in traffic, the reason for moving to this area was to be away from traffic and to live somewhere where it is safe for children to play. Making Hill Top Lane a through road would not be safe for young children.

At the junction at the end of Hill Top Lane it is already extremely difficult to turn right onto Batley Road, this is due to Batley Road already carrying heavy traffic, there is a blind corner and hill to the right and there are always cars parked opposite the junction meaning that you have to drive on the wrong side of the road round a corner meeting the brow of a hill.

Turning right out of Hill Top Grove onto Hill Top Lane has very poor visibility due to a large tree, increased traffic will cause difficulty in safely turning right onto Hill Top Lane.

West Ardsley is a sleepy village with very little other than housing and woodland in the area. People live here in order to enjoy the surrounding countryside and woodland and the wildlife it has to offer.

Not only will building in the area destroy the enjoyment residents have in the countryside and wildlife, but as there is so little in the area to do i.e. Healthcare, Shops, Parks, Fitness, Children's Entertainment, any new houses would lead to increased traffic as residents have to drive to find these things.

As an example our closest doctors surgery is at East Ardsley 2 miles drive from our home. To book an appointment, there is generally a 2 week wait just to get a routine appointment. What is proposed to cope with the additional demand on doctors surgeries and health services or will we now need to wait several more weeks just to get a routine appointment?

The wildlife in the area is quite special, we regularly have Jays visiting our garden, quite rare for these shy birds. There are many, many different species of birds in the areas, hedgehogs, foxes, what is proposed to protect these creatures?

In summary the residents of West Ardsley live here purely to enjoy wildlife, countryside, lack of traffic and tolerate the fact that they must travel out of the area for everything including for ourselves a school! To remove the wildlife, countryside and increase traffic and number of residents WOULD RUIN THIS AREA AND THE LIVES OF THE RESIDENTS!

We have completed the relevant forms on the [leeds.gov.uk](https://www.leeds.gov.uk) website and I trust that as my local MP you will represent my views at the relevant hearings/meetings and do what you can to prevent this proposal going ahead.

Name: Caroline Proctor

Representor No: PRS02096

Representation ID: REP04315 Question Ref: H9

3373A – This site is designated open land but as it forms part of the Haigh Wood Estate it should be protected as it forms a valuable green space for local residents.

Representation ID: REP04315 Question Ref: H2

3373A – This site may be designated as open land, but it should be green belt. It forms parts of the paths to Haigh Wood and is a valuable open space for residents of West Ardsley.

Also traffic has to be a major consideration. 130 houses would generate a lot of traffic on Westerton / Haigh Moor Road which are already busy.

Name: J Cowie

Representor No: PRS02227

Representation ID: REP04768 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Susan Holt

Representor No: PRS02289

Representation ID: REP04772 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Name: Dereck Holt

Representor No: PRS02311

Representation ID: REP04766 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Name: Jenni Davenport

Representor No: PRS02330

Representation ID: REP04770 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Name: Frank Raven

Representor No: PRS02339

Representation ID: REP04771 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Name: E Naylor

Representor No: PRS02363

Representation ID: REP04780 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Name: Kathleen Paver

Representor No: PRS02372

Representation ID: REP04774 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Name: C Guy

Representor No: PRS02377

Representation ID: REP04767 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: C Clegg

Representor No: PRS02406

Representation ID: REP04663 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley &
Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Name: Doreen Gill

Representor No: PRS02496

Representation ID: REP04755 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley &
Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Name: D Naylor

Representor No: PRS02497

Representation ID: REP04773 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley &
Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Name: A Paver

Representor No: PRS02498

Representation ID: REP04775 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley &
Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Name: James Bowers

Representor No: PRS02500

Representation ID: REP04777 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley &
Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Name: Alan Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02501

Representation ID: REP04778 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley &
Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Name: Vivienne Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02502

Representation ID: REP04779 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley &
Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Vivian Oxtoby

Representor No: PRS02504

Representation ID: REP04783 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley &
Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Name: Beryl Hewitt

Representor No: PRS02506

Representation ID: REP04785 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley &
Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Name: D A Clegg

Representor No: PRS02507

Representation ID: REP04788 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley &
Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Name: Pauline Wood

Representor No: PRS02508

Representation ID: REP04790 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley &
Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Name: Joyce Thompson

Representor No: PRS02510

Representation ID: REP04792 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley &
Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Name: Patricia Aston

Representor No: PRS02513

Representation ID: REP04796 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley &
Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Name: L. G Wilson

Representor No: PRS02515

Representation ID: REP04799 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley &
Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: S Laurence

Representor No: PRS02517

Representation ID: REP04801 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Name: C Graham

Representor No: PRS02518

Representation ID: REP04803 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Name: M Allsop

Representor No: PRS02520

Representation ID: REP04805 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Name: R Hartill

Representor No: PRS02521

Representation ID: REP04806 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Name: Edith Holmes

Representor No: PRS02522

Representation ID: REP04808 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Name: Harry Holmes

Representor No: PRS02524

Representation ID: REP04811 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Name: Ann Morse

Representor No: PRS02526

Representation ID: REP04813 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: L.r Morse

Representor No: PRS02527

Representation ID: REP04816 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Name: Michael Hartill

Representor No: PRS02556

Representation ID: REP04847 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Name: Jim Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02561

Representation ID: REP04852 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Name: Helen Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02562

Representation ID: REP04855 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Name: Ronald Gill

Representor No: PRS02564

Representation ID: REP04858 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Name: A.w Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02565

Representation ID: REP04859 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Name: J Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02566

Representation ID: REP04860 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Norman Dearden

Representor No: PRS02568

Representation ID: REP04857 Question Ref: H1

2128 New Lane, East Ardsley, Site Capacity 48, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

This site is adjacent to the above and similar reasons for objection apply. The possible cumulative total 960 new households is not sustainable.

Name: Edna M Buchanan-dick

Representor No: PRS02835

Representation ID: REP05387 Question Ref: H7

My objections to this development are;

1. Volume of traffic on Hilltop Lane (too narrow) leading onto Batley Road
2. Noise and car exhaust pollution from volume of traffic expected

Name: Annie McNally

Representor No: PRS03059

Representation ID: REP00387 Question Ref: G1

I think it is disgusting that the council are wanting to build on greenbelt land on proposed Plots 1336, 3373, 3372, 3373A, 3373B, 3373C, 1330B, 1330A, 536. And 3456A. It is an area of outstanding beauty where people enjoy walking, running, playing and riding horses. Many wild animals live in the fields and to take it away would turn this area into a concrete jungle. It would mean my view at the back would be eradicated, lowering the value of my house, but more importantly the pleasure I have everyday when I look across the field. This city needs green areas where we can walk and get away from the stresses of life. Also, to the rear of my property there is bindweed in the field which I believe would make it difficult for any developers to be able to build on that land. There are plenty of brown field sites which can be developed. Do not take away our green spaces. Totally outrageous.

Name: Gary Lunn

Representor No: PRS03128

Representation ID: REP01153 Question Ref: H1

New housing developments already under way on Haigh Moor Road. Further development will create increased access problems for traffic.-I have concerns about road safety due to the increased level of traffic that will arise and access roads through current housing developments will put children in particular at risk.-Schools in the immediate vicinity are generally full. Where will extra children go.-Local doctors already been extended substantially in recent years to deal with increased population. Further housing development will only increase pressure on this resource-It will be the loss of a local amenity enjoyed by many-Wildlife is plentiful in this area and adds to the enjoyment of many as well as providing habitat to animals and birds. Numerous bats can be seen in the area on an evening, these will be lost

Representation ID: REP01153 Question Ref: H7

Maintain green belt land but also development of this area would be difficult, costly and unpractical due to gradient of land

Representation ID: REP01153 Question Ref: H2

3373A & 337C

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Claire Hunter

Representor No: PRS03251

Representation ID: REP01159 Question Ref: H1

We live only 320 metres from Hill Top School, having moved here in November 2010 we have been unable to place our now 7 year old son at the school due to it being full. We have been at the top of the waiting list for several terms, but have been unable to get him into the school. We have also been unable to get our son into Westerton primary the 2nd nearest primary school. The only school that can be offered are poor performing schools out of the area. Where are additional families going to send their children to school - out of the area, driving them to school and increasing traffic! Access via Hill Top Lane will lead to a significant increase in traffic, the reason for moving to this area was to be away from traffic and to live somewhere where it is safe for children to play. Making Hill Top Lane a through road would not be safe for young children. At the junction at the end of Hill Top Lane it is already extremely difficult to turn right onto Batley Road, this is due to Batley Road already carrying heavy traffic, there is a blind corner and hill to the right and there are always cars parked opposite the junction meaning that you have to drive on the wrong side of the road round a corner meeting the brow of a hill. Turning right out of Hill Top Grove onto Hill Top Lane has very poor visibility due to a large tree, increased traffic will cause difficulty in safely turning right onto Hill Top Lane. West Ardsley is a sleepy village with very little other than housing and woodland in the area. People live here in order to enjoy the surrounding countryside and woodland and the wildlife it has to offer. Not only will building in the area destroy the enjoyment residents have in the countryside and wildlife, but as there is so little in the area to do i.e. Healthcare, Shops, Parks, Fitness, Children's Entertainment, any new houses would lead to increased traffic as residents have to drive to find these things. As an example our closest doctors surgery is at East Ardsley 2 miles drive from our home. To book an appointment, there is generally a 2 week wait just to get a routine appointment. What is proposed to cope with the additional demand on doctors surgeries and health services or will we now need to wait several more weeks just to get a routine appointment? The wildlife in the area is quite special, we regularly have Jays visiting our garden, quite rare for these shy birds. There are many, many different species of birds in the areas, hedgehogs, foxes, what is proposed to protect these creatures? In summary the residents of West Ardsley live here purely to enjoy wildlife, countryside, lack of traffic and tolerate the fact that they must travel out of the area for everything including for ourselves a school! To remove the wildlife, countryside and increase traffic and number of residents WOULD RUIN THIS AREA AND THE LIVES OF THE RESIDENTS!

Representation ID: REP01159 Question Ref: H5

Map 33 Site 3373 A & C

Representation ID: REP01159 Question Ref: H6

Map 33 Site 3373 A & C

Representation ID: REP01159 Question Ref: H8

Map 33 site 3373 A & C

Representation ID: REP01159 Question Ref: H9

Map 33 site 3373 A & C

Representation ID: REP01159 Question Ref: H2

Map 33 Site 3373 A & C The reason is given above, however summarised as: Access & Road Safety Issues from Hill Top Grove onto Hill Top Lane and from Hill Top Lane onto Batley Road. Increase traffic to an area not designed for traffic, some streets do not even have a pavement! Lack of schools and healthcare in the area to cope with existing demand. Wildlife and Countryside is the only thing West Ardsley has to offer and the only reason people choose to live here. Building on the green areas will ruin the area and the lives of residents.

Name: Michael Short

Representor No: PRS03336

Representation ID: REP00155 Question Ref: H9

Parts of 3373A which are immediately adjacent to the wood in 3373B. Parts of this are in what local people consider to be the wood.

Representation ID: REP00155 Question Ref: H2

3373A: suggested access via narrow, badly designed estate roads which are about adequate to service the existing housing. The site, in parts, is probably not economical to develop (topography, drainage, old mines etc). Will entail removal of many trees which form part of a pleasant, wooded local amenity. If developed, the character of this space (a quiet valley) will be ruined. Applying to 3373A and also 3373C, 1336 and 1337: Local roads already saturated, no places in schools or GPs, massive development will ruin the village's feel of the area.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Richard Sagar

Representor No: PRS03405

Representation ID: REP01941 Question Ref: H1

Whilst we are in broad agreement with the designation of green sites at Haigh Wood in the Outer South West area of Leeds, we have concerns regarding the boundaries between the 'green' and 'red' sites. We agree with and support the allocation of land at Haigh Wood for housing with a central area in the vicinity of Haigh Wood LNA left undisturbed, but feel that this primary objective can be better achieved with different boundaries to sites 3373A, 3373B, 3373C and 1336

Representation ID: REP01941 Question Ref: H3

As a corollary to the explanation provided at H2 and in the attached document, we suggest that parts of site 3373B be re-designated as green, in accordance with Figure 6 and Appendix 1 of that document. These sections are in areas which are not needed to be kept undeveloped for the preservation of the green corridor between the two development parcels. New access points, via Upper Green Avenue/Upper Green Way and a new junction onto Westerton Road will facilitate improved integration into the transport network. As mentioned above, the alignment of site 3373B would be more logical if it followed the suggested revised indicative masterplan included in the attached document (at Figure 6 and Appendix 1). The green corridor will be further protected by the removal of the previously suggested vehicular link road between the two parts of the Haigh Wood site. The new alignment will preserve the vast majority of the hedges and existing trees on the site, whilst allowing a more logical and achievable layout for future development. Additionally, no development is proposed within the vicinity of the LNA or the stream running down the valley.

Representation ID: REP01941 Question Ref: H8

As explained at H3 and in the attached documents, we believe that sections of site 3373B should be re-designated as green, instead of parts of site 1336 and 3373A.

Representation ID: REP01941 Question Ref: H9

As explained at H2 and in the attached documents, we suggest that parts of sites 1336 and 3373A would be more suitable for colour coding as red, whilst parts of site 3373B should be green.

Representation ID: REP01941 Question Ref: H11

The suggested revised allocations at Haigh Wood (see Figure 6 and Appendix 1 of the attached document) ('green' land) are all suitable for short term delivery.

Representation ID: REP01941 Question Ref: H2

We agree with the Council that the central valley at Haigh Wood should be excluded from development, as a green corridor between proposed development sites. This was the Council's intention in designating site 3373B as red. However, the alignment of the valley suggested by site 3373B does not accurately reflect the topography of the area, the trees, the stream and the LNA and how these will affect potential development, nor does it align with what we suggest is the true extent of the central valley. We therefore suggest that sections of sites 3373A and 1336 be re-designated as red, in accordance with the attached documents (Document for Residential and Open Space Allocation Addendum dated July 2013, in particular Figure 6 and Appendix 1, and the covering letter) outlining the detailed justification for our proposed new alignment for the central valley. The sections of sites 3373A and 1336 which we suggest are re-designated as red are not suitable for development, as they incorporate important arboricultural features which will be difficult to incorporate into a housing development and are best left as part of the green corridor between the two development parcels. Conversely, parts of site 3373B should be added as green, not red, for similar reasons, but in reverse; the area can be developed without harm to what is sought to be protected, as further explained below.

Name: Stephen Bartlett

Representor No: PRS03513

Representation ID: REP01397 Question Ref: H2

3373A, 3373C and 536. If you go ahead and build on these sites, it has been stated that Haigh wood would act as a 'green belt' for recreational purposes. The area of wood that you are talking about is barely wider than 100m and probably no longer than 500m in length!! The other reasons I have given in detail above in that I am worried this area is going to become an urban sprawl, with no parkland (albeit we have the reservoir) designated anywhere. Small thin strips of land between developments are not my idea of recreational areas - if you develop this area, then I believe you should be looking at putting in areas similar to Middleton or Roundhay park. I also don't agree with your assessment of site 1135 off Dewsbury road. Your statement should say - too costly for any developer to clear the station area, therefore not a viable proposition!!! Yes we all know it's far easier to pick a nice green field, scrape off the top soil, lay foundations, and build (for maximum profit)

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Camille Leach

Representor No: PRS03615

Representation ID: REP00848 Question Ref: H1

sites 3373A, 3373B, 3365,1258,site 1330B 464 houses in such a small vicinity is unsustainable, there are currently just over 300 pupils at Hill Top Primary School with no room for any expansion, the school is full and the same is true of Westerton. Leeds City Council have in their allocation plan confirmed that Ardsley and Robin Hood have a deficiency in parks and gardens (the only area in Leeds South West to be deficient)natural greenspace should be used to reduce the deficit and improve our community. Our GP surgeries are at breaking point the surgery at Leigh View was recently extended and it's difficult to envisage how this could be extended further.Further erosion of the demarcation between West Ardsley & Tingley – , the two areas will be barely distinguishable from each other which is contrary to the Councils policy SP1 which clearly states smaller Settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlement's size, function and sustainability. If these plans were approved it will no doubt result in urban sprawl with no identifiable boundaries. Our fields provide a public amenity development would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This view was endorsed by the Secretary of State in their past decision letter.Our road network was not built to support the existing volume of traffic , we do not have the infrastructure to support development of this scale, our public transport links are very poor with only one bus an hour into Leeds, the only viable means of transportation is by car which will have a cumulative impact on the A650 and A653 which are already congested.

Representation ID: REP00848 Question Ref: H9

site 3373A and 3373c should be coded red for all the issues previously stated plus site 3373A Lee gap Fair is held twice a year in these fields, the fair is the oldest horse fair in England dating back to 1136 and forms part of the history and heritage of the area.site 3373C It can be argued that the highways infrastructure for Site 3373B is inadequate, there are Highways concerns re poor accessibility for the number of houses proposed and then there is the issue of Highways safety with the junction of Hilltop Lane being within 100 metres of the primary school.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Camille Leach

Representor No: PRS03615

Representation ID: REP00848

Question Ref: General comment

Site 3373C Objections1. Local character and identityDevelopment of this site would be contrary to the following sections of the Council's policy SP1 in the Core Strategy:1. SP1 (i) states: "Smaller Settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlement's size, function and sustainability." Site 3373A, with its estimated capacity of 130 dwellings, does not have regard to the size, function and sustainability of West Ardsley.SP1 (iii) states: "For development to respect and enhance the local character and identity of places and neighbourhoods". The local character and identity of West Ardsley would be seriously threatened by 3373a, 3373C and 1336, and would make its component areas of Upper Green, Haigh Moor and Hill Top barely distinguishable from each other.My view accords with three decision letters from the Planning Inspectorate which were used in the Council's own evidence to the Unitary Development Plan public inquiry in 1995. In paragraph 39 of his report on the Morley Local Plan, the inspector considered that the planned development at Haigh Wood (site WA2H) would have a "very serious impact upon the character and environment of West Ardsley". He concluded in paragraph 10: "In the past, development in the Morley area would appear to have been sporadic and opportunist, placing the identity of the smaller settlements at risk and tending towards the creation of amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the length of the A650 Bradford to Wakefield road. In my view, the further diffusion of the existing loosely-knit settlement pattern should, as far as possible, be resisted."Considering appeals in 1986 on 81/23/00212 and 81/23/00213 (broadly the same area as LDF sites 3373A/B/C and 1336) the inspector said "It would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This was endorsed in the Secretary of State's decision letter.In 1994, a third inspector dismissed an appeal to develop land at Arthington Close near the the edge of Haigh Wood because it would "unacceptably erode the fringe of this rural area and would lead to pressure for further encroachment of residential development, most particularly in the fields to the west..."Although some years have passed since these decisions, the character and environment of the area are still semi-rural and just as delicate. When cogent arguments have been repeatedly made against development of the 3373 areas by the Secretary of State, by three planning inspectors and by Leeds Council itself (in evidence to the UDP inquiry), there can be no justification for sites 3373A, 3373C and 1336 being pursued for residential development in the LDF. They should instead be reclassified as "red" and withdrawn from consideration for development when producing the next stage of the plan.2. Damage to Haigh Wood and Baghill beck valleyDevelopment of this site would be contrary to the Council's policy P12 in the Core Strategy:"The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes, including their historical and cultural significance, will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness through stewardship and the planning process." The secluded Haigh Wood valley comprises the central portion of site 3373A, including part of the wood covered by a Tree Preservation Order. Residential development would prejudice the objectives underlining this policy as set out in paragraphs 5.3.46 to 5.3.48 of the Core Strategy including: "The Council seeks to protect and enhance the varied landscapes of Leeds and the assets they contain, from valued local trees, the countryside to nationally designated landscape, fauna and flora". This view was endorsed by three planning inspectors and again in the Council's evidence, given by Mr G B Andrews, at the UDP inquiry. In his paragraph 4.3.6, Mr Andrews stated: I refer to the conclusions reached by the inspectors at the two subsequent appeal cases in 1985 and 1994. In each case it is acknowledged that the Haigh Wood area is of value as an area of attractive open farmland with a rural character and provides an important amenity in the local area". Even the Council's own assessment for the LDF states that the site is: "Not supported (RED). This site includes Haigh Wood and Baghill Beck Local Nature Area which fall under UK Biological Action Plan priority habitats - a mixture of woodland, scrub and grassland habitats alongside Baghill Beck. There are a number of wide hedgerow/woodland belts throughout the site that provide a valuable habitat. Water vole has been recorded on the Hey Beck. The Baghill Beck flows into this water course and could support this species. Bats to consider."3. FairnessThe Core Strategy seeks to be "fair". The word is used in paragraph 1.2 and again in 1.14. Yet the proposed green housing sites when taken together would definitely not be fair to West Ardsley and Tingley. No justification has been given as to why there is such a concentration here, nor any evidence of local need. Indeed, paragraph 4.6.14 states that "The SHMA 2011 was not able to identify any geographically specific need for new housing based on population growth." The sites seem to have been assessed individually rather than their cumulative impact. This impact is potentially very much greater when considered alongside Kirklees Council's proposals for the Chidswell area. 4. Highway access The Upper Green culs-de-sac and Hill Top Lane cul-de-sacs are not suitable to serve more houses. They would become much less safe for children to play in and the already severe dangers at school times would be exacerbated.5. SchoolsPrimary and secondary schools already full and difficult to expand further.6. Agricultural landGood quality agricultural land would be lost.7. ViabilityExtra costs from: a. parts of 3373A and 3373C have serious levels problems and look undevelopable; b. bell pits known to exist in the area from former mining; c. elimination of Japanese Knotweed.The site on Westerton Road from Regency Gardens to Westerton Wood if developed will see 117 new homes - this land is currently classed as green belt (site 3365 = 83 homes and site 1258 = 34 homes) development here will represent a major incursion into the Green belt and will create further pressure on Ardsley reservoir as a local beauty spot. Development of sites 3365 and 1258 will result in the loss of valuable agricultural land, there are a number of wide hedgerow and woodland belts throughout the site that provide a valuable habitat for wildlife in particular bats. Development of the sites on Westerton Road will result in the amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the whole length of the Westerton Road.Site 1330B is an extension of the building that is currently ongoing adjacent to Jude's pond - and is for a further 32 houses ! This site has major highways access issues and has less than the recommended visibility splay for highways safety - further development of this site will exasperate current problems regarding drainage on the land - Haigh Moor Road residents already have to deal with flooding of the pavements and highways in the vicinity of Jude's pond. 464 houses in such a small vicinity is unsustainable, there are currently just over 300 pupils at Hill Top Primary School with no room for any expansion, the school is full and the same is true of Westerton which as you know was a small village school 20 years ago but is now one of the biggest primary schools in the Leeds district and all because of the amount of building that has taken place over recent years.Leeds City Council have in their allocation plan confirmed that Ardsley and Robin Hood have a deficiency in parks and gardens (the only area in Leeds South West to be deficient) - our children already have very little designated play areas, they have also confirmed that we are deficient in outdoor sports areas and facilities for children to play. We have however got a surplus of natural green space which is currently under threat of housing - if this natural greenspace is to be used for any purpose, surely it should be used to reduce the deficit and improve our community. Further reduction of amenity greenspace in an area which is seeing more and more housing development is unfair and unsustainable.Our GP surgeries are at breaking point with current waiting times for appointments being in excess of two weeks, the surgery at Leigh View was recently extended and it's difficult to envisage how this could be extended further to serve the population boom that will ensue if all these sites are developed.Further erosion of the demarcation between West Ardsley & Tingley - soon the two settlements will merge into one and West Ardsley as a separate community will be subsumed into its near neighbour, the two areas will be barely distinguishable from each other which is contrary to the Councils policy SP1 which clearly states smaller Settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlement's size, function and sustainability. If these plans were approved it will no doubt result in urban sprawl with no identifiable boundaries.Our fields provide a public amenity for dog-walkers, cyclists, ramblers and local residents alike and It would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This view was endorsed by the Secretary of State in their past decision letter.Our road network was not built to support the existing volume of traffic , we do not have the infrastructure to support development of this scale, our public transport links are very poor with only one bus an hour into Leeds, the only viable means of transportation is by car which will have a cumulative impact on the A650 and A653 which are already congested.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Camille Leach

Representor No: PRS03615

Representation ID: REP00848 Question Ref: H2

Objections to 3373a and 3373c Development of these sites would be contrary to SP1 in the Core Strategy: SP1 (i) No regard to the size, function and sustainability of West Ardsley. SP1 (iii) The local character and identity of West Ardsley would be seriously threatened by 3373A, 3373C and 1336, and would make the areas of Upper Green, Haigh Moor and Hill Top undistinguishable from each other. Three decision letters from the Planning Inspectorate which were used in the Council's own evidence to the UDP in 1995. In paragraph 39 of his report he considered the planned development concluding "In the past, development in the Morley area would appear to have been sporadic and opportunist, placing the identity of the smaller settlements at risk and tending towards the creation of amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the length of the A650. In my view, the further diffusion of the existing loosely-knit settlement pattern should be resisted." Appeals in 1986 on 81/23/00212 and 81/23/00213 the inspector said "It would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This was endorsed in the Secretary of State's decision letter. When cogent arguments have been repeatedly made against development of the 3373 areas by the Secretary of State, by three planning inspectors and by Leeds Council itself (in evidence to the UDP inquiry), there can be no justification for sites 3373A, 3373C and 1336 being pursued for residential development in the LDF. They should instead be reclassified as "red". Development of these sites would be contrary to the Council's policy P12 in the Core Strategy: The secluded Haigh Wood valley comprises the central portion of site 3373A, including part of the wood covered by a Tree Preservation Order. Residential development would prejudice the objectives underlining this policy as set out in paragraphs 5.3.46 to 5.3.48 of the Core Strategy.

Name: Carol Chapman

Representor No: PRS04021

Representation ID: REP00608 Question Ref: H1

1. Character of area. Development on the scale envisaged, particularly when combined with other development sites, does not "respect the character and objectives of local communities" 1670 proposed dwellings in the green sites in Tingley & Ardsley would seriously threaten the semi rural nature of the area. 2. Inadequacy of access roads. Roads linked to the proposed development site are not suitable to take the expected increase in traffic. This could lead to a threat to children's safety especially when children are going to & coming home from the nearby Westerton Primary school when the area already gets very congested. 3. School capacities. The local primary and secondary schools (Westerton, Hill Top, Blackgates and Woodkirk Academy) are already over subscribed and do not have the potential to be extended further. 4. Other community facilities. Doctors, Dentists, health centres & leisure facilities would be overstretched. 5. Building costs. There was extensive mining in the area in the past & old bell pits have already been discovered which need to be dealt with. 6. Agriculture Good quality farmland growing a variety of crops will be lost.

Representation ID: REP00608 Question Ref: H2

Leeds LDF site 3373A. Objections. 1. Character of area. Development on the scale envisaged, particularly when combined with other development sites, does not "respect the character and objectives of local communities" 1670 proposed dwellings in the green sites in Tingley & Ardsley would seriously threaten the semi rural nature of the area. 2. Damage to Haigh Wood. Site includes part of a Tree Preservation Order area. Development of this area will impact on the pretty secluded valley. There will be a threat to a wide variety of wild life present in the valley. 3. Inadequacy of access roads. Roads linked to the proposed development site are not suitable to take the expected increase in traffic. This could lead to a threat to children's safety especially when children are going to & coming home from the nearby Westerton Primary school when the area already gets very congested. 4. School capacities. The local primary and secondary schools (Westerton, Hill Top, Blackgates and Woodkirk Academy) are already over subscribed and do not have the potential to be extended further. 5. Other community facilities. Doctors, Dentists, health centres & leisure facilities in the area would be overstretched. 6. Building costs. Parts of 3373A have serious levels problems and look undevelopable. There was extensive mining in the area in the past & old bell pits have already been discovered which need to be dealt with. 7. Lee Fair fields would be built on. This historic fair would need to be relocated and an alternative site would be needed. 8. Agriculture Good quality farmland growing a variety of crops will be lost. Site 1336. objections The above objections excluding points 2 and 7

Name: Roy Wagstaff

Representor No: PRS04064

Representation ID: REP01469 Question Ref: H2

Site Reference MAP 33, 3373 A-C. Access problems by increased road traffic to Hill Top Lane/Batley Road. Road safety concerns as access to site is close to primary school and on a bad bend. Access also affected by parked vehicles outside residences directly opposite Hill Top Lane. Ability of local services to cope with extra residents attending local schools and doctors surgeries; personal experience over last six years of just getting a routine doctors appointment has gone from two days to two weeks, due to previous developments in the area. Loss of these areas reduces public access to less formal recreational space and traffic free footpaths. These developments would undoubtedly have an impact on the local wildlife in Haigh Moor Wood. (eg. Bats).

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Robin Colvill

Representor No: PRS04071

Representation ID: REP01143 Question Ref: H1

Hill Top Lane is a lane not a wide road and would not be able to take the traffic for another 120 houses, the schools are all over full children are having to travel out of the area. wildlife , bats etc would be affected in the close by woods, walkers would not have the amenity anymore, the doctors surgery cannot handle the patients they have now with sometimes 3 weeks waiting for an appointment, road safety is a major concern as school time is a nightmare on Hill top lane with double parked cars already. Even if another exit on to Haig moor rd were to be made that in itself would cause even more problems as Haig more rd is constantly full of parked cars on both sides and a real hazard to negotiate. we are not talking about a small number of homes which would probably be ok but the amount of homes is far beyond the amount that the area can accomodate, I strongly disagree with any building on this field [x]

Representation ID: REP01143 Question Ref: H5

map 31 site 3373 A-C

Representation ID: REP01143 Question Ref: H6

for reasons already given in previous question

Representation ID: REP01143 Question Ref: H8

map31 site 3373 A-C for reasons already listed n previous 2 questions

Representation ID: REP01143 Question Ref: H9

map31 site 3373 A-C for reasons already listed n previous 2 questions

Representation ID: REP01143 Question Ref: H2

map31 site 3373 A-C

Name: Sue Baker

Representor No: PRS04274

Representation ID: REP01764 Question Ref: G1

The suggestion to develop the area around Haigh Wood in West Ardsley is detrimental to the wood. This is a natural bluebell wood which is rare in this area. Increasing housing in close proximity will destroy the natural habitat. The area around West Ardsley reservoir is a prime example of over use by the local population and as such access will probably have to be closed due to damage. The same thing will happen to the wood as there will be even less greenspace for leisure. Part of the area is also covered by a mediaeval charter to allow Lee Fair to meet on the land yearly.

Name: Jacqueline Squire

Representor No: PRS04321

Representation ID: REP00393 Question Ref: G1

I think it is imperative that the small amount of green space available in this area, particularly site 3373A should be preserved. To even think about the allocation of building for houses on such areas as Haigh Wood is sacrilege when there are adequate brown field sites in Leeds which can be used to build on. The wild animal and plant life in that area is important and to build on a historical site such as where the Lee Fayre is held starts to take all the legacy and history out of the Morley area. This fayre is the largest in England and Leeds/Morley should be proud of this. Have those who are making these decisions had a look at Haigh Wood and really thought about the damage they are doing or is it just a paper exercise.

Representation ID: REP00393 Question Ref: G7

I think Haigh Wood should be kept and developed as a nature area that is made more accessible to the community. The basis is there and would be easy to develop in this way. Other areas could be developed in the same way in other areas of South Leeds. In Aireborough the using of greenspace for development does not seem to be planned as profusely as it has been planned in South Morley. Why is this?

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Michael Heath

Representor No: PRS04344

Representation ID: REP02081 Question Ref: G1

I wish to make reference to the LDP, map 31 site 3373A-C in that I have concerns re access problems by increased traffic; road safety concerns as we are close to the school; the ability of local services to cope in the event of a large influx of people; the loss of identity for the village (which has already had a vast number of additional houses in the last 10/15 years) and damage to wildlife in Haigh Moor Wood, if there is development such as proposed in this Plan.

Representation ID: REP02081 Question Ref: General comment

I wish to make reference to the LDP, map 31 site 3373A-C in that I have concerns re access problems by increased traffic; road safety concerns as we are close to the school; the ability of local services to cope in the event of a large influx of people; the loss of identity for the village (which has already had a vast number of additional houses in the last 10/15 years) and damage to wildlife in Haigh Moor Wood, if there is development such as proposed in this Plan.

Representation ID: REP02081 Question Ref: G7

I suggest that the area quoted in map 31, site 3373A-C should retain its current standing and provide a benefit to the community and some agricultural land in the same basis as is now available.

Name: Michael Bramley

Representor No: PRS04350

Representation ID: REP01455 Question Ref: H1

The areas 3373c & 3373a are not suitable for housing the area contains a large amount of bat colonies and the area is regarded by locals a a natural beauty spot with woods and fields that are a pleasure to share with the community. There are no services in West Ardsley to support a larger community, the junior school is not large enough, there is no shop and one postbox in the village even the village shop converted into flats 5 years ago. Batley Road, the road servicing West Ardsley already is used as a rat run between Dewsbury, Batley and Wakefield and nothing has been done to calm traffic and more housing would add to this. Additionally, road access to the areas would appear to be via the road Hill Top Lane. This road is not really designed or suitable as a major road artery. Hill Top Lane is regularly congested during start of school and end of school day as it is used as drop-off zone by parents, as the previously described Batley Road is too busy. This congestion is despite the local school having a car park and drop off area. Additional housing in the area will add to the congestion - both to the community and the ability for the local school to accommodate the additional child population.

Representation ID: REP01455 Question Ref: H5

As previously described 3373a & 3373c

Representation ID: REP01455 Question Ref: H2

We strongly disagree with the green belt of 3373c and 3373a being considered for housing because it will effect the natural beauty of this area, a main reason we moved here from Tingley which was allowed to over develop. We have observed the impact of overdevelopment where a large number of residential homes has a small amount of services (shops etc.) Our previous observations highlighted that in singular retail area, particularly at dusk, gets utilised by the local youngsters as a hang out as there is no where else to go - and resulting in a number of threatening and anti-social behaviour. The local area is used heavily by families as an area for taking walks - simply due to the fact that this is the ONLY safe area without using transport in the immediate district. Equally, 3373A hosts a long standing traditional event (100s years) called the the LeeFair horse show. From our own person perspective - our property overlooks 3373C and this vista presents a value-add to our property. Our property is situated on Hill Top Lane. The proposed development will have a double impact on reducing the value of our property - Hill Top Lane will become a main road rather than a quiet cul-de-sac. And the Vista our property currently enjoys will be taken away and enjoyed by the new development - this impact could be many thousands of pounds in value loss

Name: Alison Brice

Representor No: PRS04365

Representation ID: REP00325 Question Ref: H11

3373a and c -long term -preferable never

Representation ID: REP00325 Question Ref: H2

Sites: 3373a and 3373c (agree 3373b should be red) Also query 536. With sites 3373a and c I am concerned about the access - if Hill Top Lane is used the road isn't wide and the junction with Batley Road has long been a concern. Cars park directly opposite the junction (terraced houses no drives) and on both sides of Hill Top Lane - especially of concern is school pick up and drop off parking - I am surprised there hasn't been a serious accident with children from Hill Top School and speed is also a concern. If more traffic on the road accessing or cutting through the risk is so much greater. The houses were built with covenants against hedges etc to preserve sight lines.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Julia Jackson

Representor No: PRS04558

Representation ID: REP01205 Question Ref: H1

Site 3373A I do not agree that this site should be considered for future housing development. For reasons see below

Name: Samantha Halls

Representor No: PRS04583

Representation ID: REP00646 Question Ref: H1

1. Local character and identityDevelopment of site would be contrary to the following sections of the Council's policy SP1 in the Core Strategy: - Site 3373A, with its estimated capacity of 130 dwellings, does not have regard to the size, function and sustainability of West Ardsley.SP1 (iii) states: "For development to respect and enhance the local character and identity of places and neighbourhoods". The local character and identity of West Ardsley would be seriously threatened by 3373A, especially when combined with sites 3373C and 1336, and would make its component areas of Upper Green, Haigh Moor and Hill Top barely distinguishable from each other.My view accords with three decision letters from the Planning Inspectorate which were used in the Council's own evidence to the Unitary Development Plan public inquiry in 1995. In paragraph 39 of his report on Morley Local Plan, the inspector considered the planned development at Haigh Wood (site WA2H) would have a "very serious impact upon the character and environment of West Ardsley". He concluded paragraph 10: "In the past, development in the Morley area would appear to have been sporadic and opportunist, placing smaller settlements at risk and tending towards the creation of amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the length of the A650 Bradford to Wakefield road. In my view, the further diffusion of the existing loosely-knit settlement pattern should, as far as possible, be resisted."Considering appeals in 1986 on 81/23/00212 and 81/23/00213 (broadly the same area as LDF sites 3373A/B/C and 1336) the inspector said "It would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This was endorsed in the Secretary of State's decision letter.In 1994, a third inspector dismissed an appeal to develop land at Arthington Close near the the edge of Haigh Wood because it would "unacceptably erode the fringe of this rural area and lead to pressure for further encroachment of residential development, particularly in the fields to the west...".Although some years ago these decisions, the character and environment of the area are still semi-rural and just as delicate. When cogent arguments have been repeatedly made against development of the 3373 areas by the Secretary of State, by three planning inspectors and by Leeds Council itself (in evidence to the UDP inquiry), there can be no justification for sites 3373A, 3373C and 1336 being pursued for residential development in the LDF. They should instead be reclassified as "red" and withdrawn from consideration for development when producing the next stage of the plan.2.Damage to Haigh Wood and Baghill beck valley - Development of this site would be contrary to the Council's policy P12 in the Core Strategy:

Representation ID: REP00646 Question Ref: H2

I DISAGREE WITH SITES 3373A, 3373C and 1336 3. FairnessThe Core Strategy seeks to be "fair". The word is used in paragraph 1.2 and again in 1.14. Yet the proposed green housing sites when taken together would definitely not be fair to West Ardsley and Tingley. No justification has been given as to why there is such a concentration here, nor any evidence of local need. Indeed, paragraph 4.6.14 states that "The SHMA 2011 was not able to identify any geographically specific need for new housing based on population growth." The sites seem to have been assessed individually rather than their cumulative impact. This impact is potentially greater when considered alongside Kirklees proposals for Chidswell 4. Highway access - The Upper Green culs-de-sac are not suitable to serve up to 130 more houses. They would become much less safe for children to play in and already severe dangers at school times would be exacerbated.5. Schools - already full and difficult to expand further.6. Agricultural- land good quality agricultural land would be lost.7. Viability - costs from: a. parts of 3373A have serious levels problems and look undevelopable; b. bell pits known to exist in the area from former mining; c. elimination of Japanese Knotweed.

Name: Susan Galvin

Representor No: PRS04623

Representation ID: REP01649 Question Ref: H5

3373a-c as above in h2

Representation ID: REP01649 Question Ref: H2

3373 a-c. Particularly site C at the top of hill top lane, through which access would be fed. This leads off Batley road which is very dangerous already, especially during school start and finish times when traffic is increased. The addition of 144houses, mininum 2 cars per house, would be hugely detrimental to road safety and heighten risk. In addition capacity of local amenities such as schools to cope is questionable. There has been considerable building of housing in recent years, and still continuing, but no increase in capacity of amenities. Site A has comments regarding wildlife in Haigh wood, and these comments should also apply to site C, particularly bats which fly regularly across site c.

Name: Paul Stevenson

Representor No: PRS04651

Representation ID: REP01188 Question Ref: H1

Land to the west of the Hill Tops is not suitable for development.There is no sensible access, local roads and amenities (like schools and doctors) cannot cope with the needs of additional residents and, most importantly, the area is a well used local green space and amenity which should not be developed.

Representation ID: REP01188 Question Ref: H2

3373A & 3373C

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Saphena Hair

Representor No: PRS04827

Representation ID: REP00929 Question Ref: H1

Site at the end of Hill Top Lane WF3 should not be developed further.

Representation ID: REP00929 Question Ref: H2

Field at the top of Hill Top Lane WF3. The village of West Ardsley has had too many new houses built in the recent years. The field at the end of hill top lane has woods which is a nature reserve, there would be an adverse effect on the wildlife. The roads around here are not adequate for more traffic. West Ardsley is a village which is fast disappearing and merging into Tingley.

Name: Andrea Heibel

Representor No: PRS04839

Representation ID: REP00878 Question Ref: G1

Site 3373A objection. The local character and identity of West Ardsley would be seriously threatened by 3373A, especially when combined with sites 3373C and 1336, and would make its component areas of Upper Green, Haigh Moor and Hill Top barely distinguishable from each other. My view accords with three decision letters from the Planning Inspectorate which were used in the Council's own evidence to the Unitary Development Plan public inquiry in 1995. In paragraph 39 of his report on the Morley Local Plan, the inspector considered that the planned development at Haigh Wood (site WA2H) would have a "very serious impact upon the character and environment of West Ardsley". "In the past, development in the Morley area would appear to have been sporadic and opportunist, placing the identity of the smaller settlements at risk and tending towards the creation of amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the length of the A650 Bradford to Wakefield road. In my view, the further diffusion of the existing loosely-knit settlement pattern should, as far as possible, be resisted." In 1994, another inspector dismissed an appeal to develop land at Arthington Close near the edge of Haigh Wood because it would "unacceptably erode the fringe of this rural area and would lead to pressure for further encroachment of residential development, most particularly in the fields to the west...".

Representation ID: REP00878 Question Ref: G7

The secluded Haigh Wood valley comprises the central portion of site 3373A, including part of the wood covered by a Tree Preservation Order. Residential development would prejudice the objectives underlining this policy as set out in paragraphs 5.3.46 to 5.3.48 of the Core Strategy including: "The Council seeks to protect and enhance the varied landscapes of Leeds and the assets they contain, from valued local trees, the countryside to nationally designated landscape, fauna and flora". This site includes Haigh Wood and Baghill Beck Local Nature Area which fall under UK Biological Action Plan priority habitats - a mixture of woodland, scrub and grassland habitats alongside Baghill Beck. There are a number of wide hedgerow/woodland belts throughout the site that provide a valuable habitat. Water vole has been recorded on the Hey Beck. The Baghill Beck flows into this water course and could support this species. Bats to consider. "The Core Strategy seeks to be "fair". The word is used in paragraph 1.2 and again in 1.14. Yet the proposed green housing sites when taken together would definitely not be fair to West Ardsley and Tingley. No justification has been given as to why there is such a concentration here, nor any evidence of local need. Indeed, paragraph 4.6.14 states that "The SHMA 2011 was not able to identify any geographically specific need for new housing based on population growth." The sites seem to have been assessed individually rather than their cumulative impact. This impact is potentially very much greater when considered alongside Kirklees Council's proposals for the Chidswell area. The Upper Green culs-de-sac are not suitable to serve up to 130 more houses. They would become much less safe for children to play in and the already severe dangers at school times would be exacerbated. Primary and secondary schools already full and difficult to expand further. Good quality agricultural land would be lost. Extra costs from: a. parts of 3373A have serious levels problems and look undevelopable; b. bell pits known to exist in the area from former mining; c. elimination of Japanese Knotweed

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Samantha Halls

Representor No: PRS05085

Representation ID: REP05653 Question Ref: H1

Site 3373A. Objections

1. Local character and identity

Development of this site would be contrary to the following sections of the Council's policy SP1 in the Core Strategy:

1. SP1 (i) states: "Smaller Settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlement's size, function and sustainability."

Site 3373A, with its estimated capacity of 130 dwellings, does not have regard to the size, function and sustainability of West Ardsley.

SP1 (iii) states: "For development to respect and enhance the local character and identity of places and neighbourhoods". The local character and identity of West Ardsley would be seriously threatened by 3373A, especially when combined with sites 3373C and 1336, and would make its component areas of Upper Green, Haigh Moor and Hill Top barely distinguishable from each other.

My view accords with three decision letters from the Planning Inspectorate which were used in the Council's own evidence to the Unitary Development Plan public inquiry in 1995. In paragraph 39 of his report on the Morley Local Plan, the inspector considered that the planned development at Haigh Wood (site WA2H) would have a "very serious impact upon the character and environment of West Ardsley". He concluded in paragraph 10: "In the past, development in the Morley area would appear to have been sporadic and opportunist, placing the identity of the smaller settlements at risk and tending towards the creation of amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the length of the A650 Bradford to Wakefield road. In my view, the further diffusion of the existing loosely-knit settlement pattern should, as far as possible, be resisted." Considering appeals in 1986 on 81/23/00212 and 81/23/00213 (broadly the same area as LDF sites 3373A/B/C and 1336) the inspector said "It would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This was endorsed in the Secretary of State's decision letter.

In 1994, a third inspector dismissed an appeal to develop land at Arthington Close near the the edge of Haigh Wood because it would "unacceptably erode the fringe of this rural area and would lead to pressure for further encroachment of residential development, most particularly in the fields to the west...".

Although some years have passed since these decisions, the character and environment of the area are still semi-rural and just as delicate. When cogent arguments have been repeatedly made against development of the 3373 areas by the Secretary of State, by three planning inspectors and by Leeds Council itself (in evidence to the UDP inquiry), there can be no justification for sites 3373A, 3373C and 1336 being pursued for residential development in the LDF. They should instead be reclassified as "red" and withdrawn from consideration for development when producing the next stage of the plan.

2. Damage to Haigh Wood and Baghill beck valley

Development of this site would be contrary to the Council's policy P12 in the Core Strategy:

"The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes, including their historical and cultural significance, will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness through stewardship and the planning process." The secluded Haigh Wood valley comprises the central portion of site 3373A, including part of the wood covered by a Tree Preservation Order. Residential development would prejudice the objectives underlining this policy as set out in paragraphs 5.3.46 to 5.3.48 of the Core Strategy including: "The Council seeks to protect and enhance the varied landscapes of Leeds and the assets they contain, from valued local trees, the countryside to nationally designated landscape, fauna and flora".

This view was endorsed by three planning inspectors and again in the Council's evidence, given by Mr G B Andrews, at the UDP inquiry. In his paragraph 4.3.6, Mr Andrews stated: I refer to the conclusions reached by the inspectors at the two subsequent appeal cases in 1985 and 1994. In each case it is acknowledged that the Haigh Wood area is of value as an area of attractive open farmland with a rural character and provides an important amenity in the local area". Even the Council's own assessment for the LDF states that the site is: "Not supported (RED). This site includes Haigh Wood and Baghill Beck Local Nature Area which fall under UK Biological Action Plan priority habitats - a mixture of woodland, scrub and grassland habitats alongside Baghill Beck. There are a number of wide hedgerow/woodland belts throughout the site that provide a valuable habitat. Water vole has been recorded on the Hey Beck. The Baghill Beck flows into this water course and could support this species. Bats to consider."

3. Fairness

The Core Strategy seeks to be "fair". The word is used in paragraph 1.2 and again in 1.14. Yet the proposed green housing sites when taken together would definitely not be fair to West Ardsley and Tingley. No justification has been given as to why there is such a concentration here, nor any evidence of local need. Indeed, paragraph 4.6.14 states that "The SHMA 2011 was not able to identify any geographically specific need for new housing based on population growth." The sites seem to have been assessed individually rather than their cumulative impact. This impact is potentially very much greater when considered alongside Kirklees Council's proposals for the Chidswell area.

4. Highway access

The Upper Green culs-de-sac are not suitable to serve up to 130 more houses. They would become much less safe for children to play in and the already severe dangers at school times would be exacerbated.

5. Schools

Primary and secondary schools already full and difficult to expand further.

6. Agricultural land

Good quality agricultural land would be lost.

7. Viability

Extra costs from: a. parts of 3373A have serious levels problems and look undevelopable; b. bell pits known to exist in the area from former mining; c. elimination of Japanese Knotweed.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Helen Fawcett

Representor No: PRS05088

Representation ID: REP05663 Question Ref: H4

we wish to register our protest as to the proposed building of New houses at the fields at the end of Hill Top Lane, Tingley WF3 1HT.

the reasons are -- 1 destruction of woodland, wild -life habitat.

2 increased traffic a danger to residents, especially to children

3 access from Batley Road would be dangerous , due to bad bend in Batley road

4 near to school, increased traffic a danger for school children

5 parking on road a problem now for school attenders, would be worse if road upgraded

Name: Geoffrey Barker

Representor No: PRS05093

Representation ID: REP05661 Question Ref: H1

we wish to register our protest as to the proposed building of New houses at the fields at the end of Hill Top Lane, Tingley WF3 1HT.

the reasons are -- 1 destruction of woodland, wild -life habitat.

2 increased traffic a danger to residents, especially to children

3 access from Batley Road would be dangerous , due to bad bend in Batley road

4 near to school, increased traffic a danger for school children

5 parking on road a problem now for school attenders, would be worse if road upgraded

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Andrea Heibel

Representor No: PRS05109

Representation ID: REP05689 Question Ref: H1

Please note my objections to the proposed developments below.

The proposal for site 3373A (This is the site that runs from the top of

Baghill around the back of Arthington Close and Upper Green and will finish

on Westerton Road opposite Lonsdale Rise) is to build 130 houses. Lee gap

Fair is held twice a year in these fields, the fair is the oldest horse fair

in England dating back to 1136 and forms part of the history and heritage of

the area.

The 3373C site which will run from the top of Hilltop Lane and carve up all

the fields from there to Nook Green on Haigh Moor Road is for 144 houses. It

can be argued that the highways infrastructure for Site 3373B is inadequate,

there are Highways concerns re poor accessibility for the number of houses

proposed and then there is the issue of Highways safety with the junction of

Hilltop Lane being within 100 metres of the primary school. All the issues

on the attached letter are also relevant for site 3373C.

The site on Westerton Road from Regency Gardens to Westerton Wood if

developed will see 117 new homes - this land is currently classed as green

belt (site 3365 = 83 homes and site 1258 = 34 homes)

development here will

represent a major incursion into the Green belt and will create further

pressure on Ardsley reservoir as a local beauty spot.

Development of sites

3365 and 1258 will result in the loss of valuable agricultural land, there

are a number of wide hedgerow and woodland belts throughout the site that

provide a valuable habitat for wildlife in particular bats.

Development of

the sites on Westerton Road will result in the amorphous sprawl of

development across the area along the whole length of the Westerton Road.

Site 1330B is an extension of the building that is currently ongoing

adjacent to Jude's pond - and is for a further 32 houses ! This site has

major highways access issues and has less than the recommended visibility

splay for highways safety - further development of this site will exasperate

current problems regarding drainage on the land - Haigh Moor Road residents

already have to deal with flooding of the pavements and highways in the

vicinity of Jude's pond.

Please note that all these sites are in addition to any planning applications that have already been approved.

464 houses in such a small vicinity is unsustainable, there are currently

just over 300 pupils at Hill Top Primary School with no room for any

expansion, the school is full and the same is true of Westerton which as you

know was a small village school 20 years ago but is now one of the biggest

primary schools in the Leeds district and all because of the amount of

building that has taken place over recent years.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Andrea Heibel

Representor No: PRS05109

Leeds City Council have in their allocation plan confirmed that Ardsley and Robin Hood have a deficiency in parks and gardens (the only area in Leeds South West to be deficient) - our children already have very little designated play areas, they have also confirmed that we are deficient in outdoor sports areas and facilities for children to play. We have however got a surplus of natural green space which is currently under threat of housing - if this natural greenspace is to be used for any purpose, surely it should be used to reduce the deficit and improve our community. Further reduction of amenity greenspace in an area which is seeing more and more housing development is unfair and unsustainable. Our GP surgeries are at breaking point with current waiting times for appointments being in excess of two weeks, the surgery at Leigh View was recently extended and it's difficult to envisage how this could be extended further to serve the population boom that will ensue if all these sites are developed. Further erosion of the demarcation between West Ardsley & Tingley - soon the two settlements will merge into one and West Ardsley as a separate community will be subsumed into its near neighbour, the two areas will be barely distinguishable from each other which is contrary to the Councils policy SP1 which clearly states smaller Settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlement's size, function and sustainability. If these plans were approved it will no doubt result in urban sprawl with no identifiable boundaries. Our fields provide a public amenity for dog-walkers, cyclists, ramblers and local residents alike and It would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This view was endorsed by the Secretary of State in their past decision letter. Our road network was not built to support the existing volume of traffic , we do not have the infrastructure to support development of this scale, our public transport links are very poor with only one bus an hour into Leeds, the only viable means of transportation is by car which will have a cumulative impact on the A650 and A653 which are already congested. I look forward to your response and confirmation that these developments will not go ahead

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Lynsey Morris

Representor No: PRS05111

Representation ID: REP05692 Question Ref: H1

Hi,

I would like to object against the planning proposals for the following sites on Map 33 (off Westerton Road)

1336

3373B

3373A

1330B

33732

3365

3373C

3456A

3456B

1258

I suggest that these should all be changed to RED due to the following reasons:

Too much traffic already so roads will be extremely busy right outside my front door. I have young children and will be scared for their safety.

Services such as Doctors surgery's, dentists, local hospitals, schools, supermarkets already too busy so won't be able to cope

Less water will be absorbed into the ground resulting in more flooding in our gardens.

This is currently already happening in several houses on Westerton Road including mine.

There are bats, foxes, owls, frogs, newts and many birds living in the area especially on sites 1336, 3373A, 3373B, 3373C. Should these not be protected?

House prices for homeowners in the area already will decrease.

We moved to the area because of the greenery and our view will be spoilt.

The sewerage system in place on Westerton Road recently failed causing waste from the sewers to overflow into nearby houses. This was due to the recent housing developments that have recently been built nearby so the sewerage system was unable to cope. This could very likely happen again.

Name: D, M, S Johnson And Kenny

Representor No: PRS05119

Representation ID: REP05702 Question Ref: General comment

Firstly I would like to express my disappointment and embarrassment towards the councils plans for the proposed plans listed below. I understand the reason behind the lack of communication with the residents in the area may be beneficial to the local council and certain government groups. It obviously cuts down on man hours and paperwork.

I would like to object against the planning proposals for the following sites on Map 33 (off Westerton Road)

1336

3373B

3373A

1330B

33732

3365

3373C

3456A

3456B

1258

The infrastructure in this area will struggle to cope with the demands of the services required.

The area is attracting wildlife not seen in built up areas. It seems a shame to disregard the wildlife issue I'm sure if a full environmental survey of the area was to be carried out this would scupper the planning permission. But again that would be an extra cost to the council which would have an impact at year end when the books are balanced.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Ian Morris

Representor No: PRS05121

Representation ID: REP05700 Question Ref: H1

Firstly I would like to express my disappointment and embarrassment towards the councils plans for the proposed plans listed below. I understand the reason behind the lack of communication with the residents in the area may be beneficial to the local council and certain government groups. It obviously cuts down on man hours and paperwork.

I would like to object against the planning proposals for the following sites on Map 33 (off Westerton Road)

- 1336
- 3373B
- 3373A
- 1330B
- 33732
- 3365
- 3373C
- 3456A
- 3456B
- 1258

The infrastructure in this area will struggle to cope with the demands of the services required.

The area is attracting wildlife not seen in built up areas. It seems a shame to disregard the wildlife issue I'm sure if a full environmental survey of the area was to be carried out this would scupper the planning permission. But again that would be an extra cost to the council which would have an impact at year end when the books are balanced.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Eric Mearis

Representor No: PRS05165

Representation ID: REP05748 Question Ref: H1

I wish to object to the above sites on the following basis

Site 3373A and 3373C Objections

1. Local character and identity

Development of these sites would be contrary to the following

sections of the Council's policy SP1 in the Core Strategy:

1. SP1 (i) states: "Smaller Settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlement's size, function and sustainability."

Sites 3373A and 3373C with their estimated capacity of 277 dwellings, does not have regard to the size, function and sustainability of West Ardsley.

SP1 (iii) states: "For development to respect and enhance the local character and identity of places and neighbourhoods". The local character and identity of West Ardsley would be seriously threatened especially when combined with sites 3373A, 3373C and 1336, and would make its component areas of Upper Green, Haigh Moor and Hill Top barely distinguishable from each other.

My view accords with three decision letters from the Planning Inspectorate which were used in the Council's own evidence to the Unitary Development Plan public inquiry in 1995. In paragraph 39 of his report on the Morley Local Plan, the inspector considered that the planned development at Haigh Wood (site WA2H) would have a "very serious impact upon the character and environment of West Ardsley". He concluded in paragraph 10: "In the past, development in the Morley area would appear to have been sporadic and opportunistic, placing the identity of the smaller settlements at risk and tending towards the creation of amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the length of the A650 Bradford to Wakefield road. In my view, the further diffusion of the existing loosely-knit settlement pattern should, as far as possible, be resisted."

Considering appeals in 1986 on 81/23/00212 and 81/23/00213 (broadly the same area as LDF sites 3373A/B/C and 1336) the inspector said "It would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This was endorsed in the Secretary of State's decision letter.

In 1994, a third inspector dismissed an appeal to develop land at Arthington Close near the edge of Haigh Wood because it would "unacceptably erode the fringe of this rural area and would lead to pressure for further encroachment of residential development, most particularly in the fields to the west."

Although some years have passed since these decisions, the character and environment of the area are still semi-rural and just as delicate. When cogent arguments have been repeatedly made against development of the 3373 areas by the Secretary of State, by three planning inspectors and by Leeds Council itself (in evidence to the UDP inquiry), there can be no justification for sites 3373A, 3373C and 1336 being pursued for residential development in the LDF. They should instead be reclassified as "red" and withdrawn from consideration for development when producing the next stage of the plan.

2. Damage to Haigh Wood and Baghill beck valley

Development of this site would be contrary to the Council's policy

P12 in the Core Strategy:

"The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes, including their historical and cultural significance, will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness through stewardship and the planning process." The secluded Haigh Wood valley comprises the central portion of site 3373A, including part of the wood covered by a Tree Preservation Order. Residential development would prejudice the objectives underlining this policy as set out in paragraphs 5.3.46 to 5.3.48 of the Core Strategy including: "The Council seeks to protect and enhance the varied landscapes of Leeds and the assets they contain, from valued local trees, the countryside to nationally designated landscape, fauna and flora". This view was endorsed by three planning inspectors and again in the Council's evidence, given by Mr G B Andrews, at the UDP inquiry. In his paragraph 4.3.6, Mr Andrews stated: I refer to the conclusions reached by the inspectors at the two subsequent appeal cases in 1985 and 1994. In each case it is acknowledged that the Haigh Wood area is of value as an area of attractive open farmland with a rural character and provides an important amenity in the local area". Even the Council's own assessment for the LDF states that the site is: "Not supported (RED). This site includes Haigh Wood and Baghill Beck Local Nature Area which fall under UK Biological Action Plan priority habitats - a mixture of woodland, scrub and grassland habitats alongside Baghill Beck. There are a number of wide hedgerow/woodland belts

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Eric Mearis

Representor No: PRS05165

throughout the site that provide a valuable habitat. Water vole has been recorded on the Hey Beck. The Baghill Beck flows into this water course and could support this species. Bats to consider."

3. Fairness

The Core Strategy seeks to be "fair". The word is used in paragraph 1.2 and again in 1.14. Yet the proposed green housing sites when taken together would definitely not be fair to West Ardsley and Tingley. No justification has been given as to why there is such a concentration here, nor any evidence of local need. Indeed, paragraph 4.6.14 states that "The SHMA 2011 was not able to identify any geographically specific need for new housing based on population growth." The sites seem to have been assessed individually rather than their cumulative impact. This impact is potentially very much greater when considered alongside Kirklees Council's proposals for the Chidswell area.

4. Highway access

The Upper Green culs-de-sac and Hill Top Lane cul-de-sacs are not suitable to serve up to 274 more houses. They would become much less safe for children to play in and the already severe dangers at school times would be exacerbated. Both cul-de-sacs are within 100 metres of primary schools

5. Schools

Primary and secondary schools already full and difficult to expand further.

6. Agricultural land

Good quality agricultural land would be lost.

7. Viability

Extra costs from: a. parts of 3373A have serious levels problems and look undevelopable; b. bell pits known to exist in the area from former mining; c. elimination of Japanese Knotweed.

OTHER POINTS TO BE RAISED

Site 3373A Lee gap Fair is held twice a year in these fields, the fair is the oldest horse fair in England dating back to 1136 and forms part of the history and heritage of the area.

The 3373C site the highways infrastructure for Site 3373C is inadequate, there are Highways concerns re poor accessibility for the number of houses proposed and then there is the issue of Highways safety with the junction of Hilltop Lane being within 100 metres of the primary school

The site on Westerton Road from Regency Gardens to Westerton Wood this land is currently classed as green belt (site 3365 = 83 homes and site 1258 = 34 homes) development here will represent a major incursion into the Green belt and will create further pressure on Ardsley reservoir as a local beauty spot. Development of sites 3365 and 1258 will result in the loss of valuable agricultural land, there are a number of wide hedgerow and woodland belts throughout the site that provide a valuable habitat for wildlife in particular bats. Development of the sites on Westerton Road will result in the amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the whole length of the Westerton Road.

Site 1330B is an extension of the building that is currently ongoing adjacent to Jude's pond - and is for a further 32 houses ! This site has major highways access issues and has less than the recommended visibility splay for highways safety - further development of this site will exasperate current problems regarding drainage on the land - Haigh Moor Road residents already have to deal with flooding of the pavements and highways in the vicinity of Jude's pond.

464 houses in such a small vicinity is unsustainable, there are currently just over 300 pupils at Hill Top Primary School with no room for any expansion, the school is full and the same is true of Westerton which as you know was a small village school 20 years ago but is now one of the biggest primary schools in the Leeds district and all because of the amount of building that has taken place over recent years.

Leeds City Council have in their allocation plan confirmed that Ardsley and Robin Hood have a deficiency in parks and gardens (the only area in Leeds South West to be deficient) - our children already have very little designated play areas, they have also confirmed that we are deficient in outdoor sports areas and facilities for children to play. We have however got a surplus of natural green space which is currently under threat of housing - if this natural greenspace is to be used for any purpose, surely it should be used to reduce the deficit and improve our community. Further reduction of amenity greenspace in an area which is seeing more and more housing development is unfair and unsustainable.

Our GP surgeries are at breaking point with current waiting times for appointments being in excess of two weeks, the surgery at Leigh View was recently extended and it's difficult to envisage how this could be extended further to serve the population boom that will ensue if all these sites are

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Eric Mearis

Representor No: PRS05165

developed.

Further erosion of the demarcation between West Ardsley & Tingley - soon the two settlements will merge into one and West Ardsley as a separate community will be subsumed into its near neighbour, the two areas will be barely distinguishable from each other which is contrary to the Councils policy SP1 which clearly states smaller Settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlement's size, function and sustainability. If these plans were approved it will no doubt result in urban sprawl with no identifiable boundaries.

Our fields provide a public amenity for dog-walkers, cyclists, ramblers and local residents alike and It would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This view was endorsed by the Secretary of State in their past decision letter.

Our road network was not built to support the existing volume of traffic , we do not have the infrastructure to support development of this scale, our public transport links are very poor with only one bus an hour into Leeds, the only viable means of transportation is by car which will have a cumulative impact on the A650 and A653 which are already congested

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Stephen Cowling

Representor No: PRS05177

Representation ID: REP05759 Question Ref: H1

I wish to object to 3373A, 3373B & 3373C.

[x]

I wish to object on the following grounds:

. The Haigh Wood site reference is 3373, and it is split into 3 parts:

. 3373A is land between Westerton Road & Haigh Wood. This has been assessed as suitable for residential development, with a capacity of 130 houses.

. 3373B is Haigh Wood itself. This has been assessed as unsuitable for residential development because of the topography of the site and access

. 3373C is the fields between Haigh Wood & Woollin Crescent, linking right round to Nook Farm.

The proposal for site 3373A (This is the site that runs from the top of Baghill around the back of Arthington Close and Upper Green and will finish on Westerton Road opposite Lonsdale Rise) is to build 130 houses. Lee gap Fair is held twice a year in these fields, the fair is the oldest horse fair in England dating back to 1136 and forms part of the history and heritage of the area.

The 3373C site which will run from the top of Hilltop Lane and carve up all the fields from there to Nook Green on Haigh Moor Road is for 144 houses. It can be argued that the highways infrastructure for Site 3373B is inadequate, there are Highways concerns re poor accessibility for the number of houses proposed and then there is the issue of Highways safety with the junction of Hilltop Lane being within 100 metres of the primary school. All the issues on the attached letter are also relevant for site 3373C.

The site on Westerton Road from Regency Gardens to Westerton Wood if developed will see 117 new homes - this land is currently classed as green belt (site 3365 = 83 homes and site 1258 = 34 homes) development here will represent a major incursion into the Green belt and will create further pressure on Ardsley reservoir as a local beauty spot. Development of sites 3365 and 1258 will result in the loss of valuable agricultural land, there are a number of wide hedgerow and woodland belts throughout the site that provide a valuable habitat for wildlife in particular bats. Development of the sites on Westerton Road will result in the amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the whole length of the Westerton Road. Site 1330B is an extension of the building that is currently ongoing adjacent to Jude's pond - and is for a further 32 houses ! This site has major highways access issues and has less than the recommended visibility splay for highways safety - further development of this site will exasperate current problems regarding drainage on the land - Haigh Moor Road residents already have to deal with flooding of the pavements and highways in the vicinity of Jude's pond.

Please note that all these sites are in addition to any planning applications that have already been approved.

464 houses in such a small vicinity is unsustainable, there are currently just over 300 pupils at Hill Top Primary School with no room for any expansion, the school is full and the same is true of Westerton which as you know was a small village school 20 years ago but is now one of the biggest primary schools in the Leeds district and all because of the amount of building that has taken place over recent years.

Leeds City Council have in their allocation plan confirmed that Ardsley and Robin Hood have a deficiency in parks and gardens (the only area in Leeds South West to be deficient) - our children already have very little designated play areas, they have also confirmed that we are deficient in outdoor sports areas and facilities for children to play. We have however got a surplus of natural green space which is currently under threat of housing - if this natural greenspace is to be used for any purpose, surely it should be used to reduce the deficit and improve our community. Further reduction of amenity greenspace in an area which is seeing more and more housing development is unfair and unsustainable.

Our GP surgeries are at breaking point with current waiting times for appointments being in excess of two weeks, the surgery at Leigh View was recently extended and it's difficult to envisage how this could be extended further to serve the population boom that will ensue if all these sites are developed.

Further erosion of the demarcation between West Ardsley & Tingley - soon the two settlements will merge into one and West Ardsley as a separate community will be subsumed into its near neighbour, the two areas will be barely distinguishable from each other which is contrary to the Councils policy SP1 which clearly states smaller Settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlement's size, function and sustainability. If these plans were approved it will no doubt

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Stephen Cowling

Representor No: PRS05177

result in urban sprawl with no identifiable boundaries. Our fields provide a public amenity for dog-walkers, cyclists, ramblers and local residents alike and It would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This view was endorsed by the Secretary of State in their past decision letter.

Our road network was not built to support the existing volume of traffic , we do not have the infrastructure to support development of this scale, our public transport links are very poor with only one bus an hour into Leeds, the only viable means of transportation is by car which will have a cumulative impact on the A650 and A653 which are already congested I trust that this is in order.

Regards

[x]

Name: Brian Judge

Representor No: PRS05411

Representation ID: REP06013 Question Ref: H1

3373a - Suggested change GREEN to RED

Reason for change - Very narrow strip of land further development would completely the whole natural appearance and attraction views of the wood. Development on scale envisaged particularly when combined with other sites does not respect character and objectives of the local community.

Other remarks - Further house buildings would also increase traffic problems on Westerton Road at school times. We already have major difficulties in getting in and out of their homes with vehicles parked up on both sides of Upper Green Avenue and Way Drive. Restricting views of oncoming traffic both ways on Westerton Road.3373a - Suggested change GREEN to RED

Reason for change - Very narrow strip of land further development would completely the whole natural appearance and attraction views of the wood. Development on scale envisaged particularly when combined with other sites does not respect character and objectives of the local community.

Other remarks - Further house buildings would also increase traffic problems on Westerton Road at school times. We already have major difficulties in getting in and out of their homes with vehicles parked up on both sides of Upper Green Avenue and Way Drive. Restricting views of oncoming traffic both ways on Westerton Road.

Name: Lisa Mulherin

Representor No: PRS05734

Representation ID: REP07126 Question Ref: H1

3373A and C either side of Haigh Wood – 274houses across these sites are unsustainable. There is a significant lack of school places. Both Hilltop and Westerton Primary are full. Hilltop is a tightly constrained PFI site and it is hard to see how it could be expanded. Westerton is already 3 form entry. Public transport links are terrible. For those reliant on public transport it is a two hour round trip to the GPs on Bradford Road. Open views across Haigh Wood would inevitably be damaged (a feature that a previous planning inspector was keen to maintain. Access to site 3373C would be potentially dangerous exiting on to Batley Road at the brow of the hill near Hilltop Primary. These Green Belt sites should be re-designated Red.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Neil Dawson

Representor No: PRS05884

Representation ID: REP06563 Question Ref: H1

Suggested sites from Green to Red;

1029
1072
1143B
1143D
1200A
1258
1344
3365
3373A
3373C
3456A

All of the above sites are in the current Green Belt with the exception of the 3373A and 3373C which are open land.

The other sites are all located within the existing Green Belt and any development would lead to increased urban sprawl between the various townships in the Outer South West, and lead to coalescence between communities.

Development of the Green Belt sites would also reduce the open green area between settlements and create encroachment into the countryside around Morley.

In addition there is insufficient road capacity in the area particularly the very busy single carriageway A650 from East Ardsley to Tingley. Even if there is no development of the above sites there is in the allocation plan over 1,200 additional new houses close to the A650 which will put additional strain on this busy road.

The Haigh Moor sites are part of a natural valley which is popular for recreational activities. The whole site is considered best treated as one, therefore if the largest part 3373B is not to be used for housing then the other parts of the site should be treated in a similar manner. This should be retained as open green space.

Site 1072 is in the Green Belt and although there are properties adjacent it is located near to the A653 and shares similar characteristics to site 3078B which is not considered suitable for development. A development at this site would set a precedent for incursion into the Green Belt between Leeds and Kirklees.

See rep for full details.

Name: Karen Williams

Representor No: PRS06027

Representation ID: REP06857 Question Ref: H1

Sites 3373A & 3373C, Green to Red (assumed)

I believe the areas in question are the only green areas left in the area for children to play, people to walk their dogs etc, Tingley is already overcrowded with schools so much so that local children are having to travel to schools further away. This is the last of the green belt area left in tingley/ardsley. We already have too much traffic for such a built up area.

Name: Karen Renshaw

Representor No: PRS06048

Representation ID: REP06876 Question Ref: H1

3373A & 3373C Haigh Wood, West Ardsley – total of 274 properties. This is unacceptable and the area could not facilitate and/or accommodate this number of properties.. Local children have no places within their schools already and its also a 2 hour journey to access the Dr's surgery for these local residents. The bus and transport service is inadequate and would need to be addressed as well as roads not created to take the amount of traffic which would be using the highways, endangering local residents and young people on school journeys. This area would lose its character and identity by developments merging different localities into one blur – villages and area gone forever.

Many of the reasons for opposing all these sites identified are based on the lack of infrastructure, schools & education, transport, safety, health & well-being, Gp's surgeries, poor links with public transport, noise, pollution and busy highways created by the increased volume of traffic. Please take all these serious matters into account and I would appreciate a briefing before any further decisions are made.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: West Ardsley Consortium

Representor No: PRS06168

Representation ID: REP06984 Question Ref: H1

Allocations Issues and Options Document- Sites 536 (Nook Farm) , 1330 B (Adjacent to Judes Pond), 1336 (Westerton Road, and 3373 A, Band C (Haigh Wood)

We act on behalf of the West Ardsley Consortium that has made formal comments to the Leeds Site Allocations Issues and Options documents. We enclose a copy of the Document submitted with the formal response for your information.

Our clients are interested in sites 536 (Nook Farm) , 1330 8 (Adjacent to Judes Pond), 1336 (Westerton Road, and 3373 A, 8 and C (Haigh Wood) and have previously made representations for the sites to be allocated, along with a substantial area of ecologically maintained open space centred around the Haigh Wood area.

Having seen the draft proposals our clients are supportive in principle of the Councils approach to identifying a large portion of the land promoted by them for residential development. The areas identified as "Green" (for development) in the Issues and Options document at Haigh Wood amount to 16.83 Ha of land with a suggested dwelling capacity of over 400 units (at a reasonably low 25/Ha). The areas identified as "Red" (felt to be not suitable for development) amount to 17.5 Ha. This sets an approach of slightly over half the land being protected from development.

We note that the site known as Nook Farm (536) is an existing UDPR commitment and has no policy designation that has or would suggest anything other than its suitability for residential development. That site also has (contrary to the suggestion in the Issues and Options document) an extant planning permission. The details of this are set out in our formal representations.

I have reviewed the indicative boundaries suggested between the "Green" and "Red" sites in the Issues and Options document and undertaken a detailed assessment against trees, topography, the LNA of Haigh Wood and the stream running through it, whilst acknowledging the need for an uninterrupted green corridor separating the north west and south east areas of land, our clients are firmly of the view that the Councils preliminary work does not produce appropriate boundaries between development allocations and non development allocations. For example as figure 3 in the attached document shows land is identified by the Council for development in site 33 73A that includes part of the LNA, the trees of Haigh Wood and the stream running through it, whilst seeking to protect from development land to the south east which has none of those considerations applying to it.

Utilising the work already done on ecology, trees and hedges, landscape and topography, our Clients have carefully considered the Councils objectives and aspirations from the comments in the tables and proposals associated with the Issues and Options document. They have produced a revised masterplan and from that been able to identify appropriate development and allocation boundaries. These maintain a broad green corridor through the valley, protecting ecological interests, trees and the stream as well as views and the "open feel" of the valley itself. In particular this has not only widened the broad swathe of green between the development areas, compared to the earlier 2012 masterplan, but removed any road connections across the valley.

The resultant masterplan has been informed by all the Consortium team's professional disciplines and the changed highways connections fully evaluated to ensure they work appropriately.

The outcome is that of the area in the UDPR that is identified as N 11 (some 36.14 Ha) only 40% is now proposed for development. The suggested allocations (boundaries shown in red on Figure 6 of the attached document include (so that the allocations are not excessively subdivided) substantial green corridors and strategic planting, amounting to some 3.241ha. These run along the existing and proposed pedestrian and bridleway access corridors to the valley and the Wood. The suggested total area of the allocations (including the 3.24 Ha of undeveloped green space) is under half of the current N 11 land at 17.66 Ha. We believe this provides the right balance of development and protection of the wider site.

We note that the areas identified as "Green" in the Issues and Options document in this Outer South West area are insufficient by some margin (1,432) to meet the Core Strategy suggested proportion of housing for the area, even taking into account (and not questioning) the amount of development to come forward from permissions and existing allocations. There should be no doubt that all "Green" sites should therefore go forward for allocation. Indeed more will need to be found from "Amber" or even "Red" sites to provide sufficient land. In addition, there are proportionately far fewer "Green" sites (compared to "Amber") in East and West Ardsley than there are in Morley or the rest of the Outer South West.

The site at Haigh Wood with its non greenbelt status and accessibility and sustainability credentials provides a very good location for development and the provision of material environmental benefits through protection, increased access and environmental management of the Wood itself. As there have to be exceptional circumstances to take land out of the greenbelt, there must correspondingly be exceptional circumstances not to develop at Haigh Wood ahead of greenbelt land.

For all of these reasons our clients, look forward to working with the Council to bring forward development in line with the attached revised masterplan, which we believe fully addresses all comments made in the Issues and Options document and the related concerns about the land at Haigh Wood.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: West Ardsley Consortium

Representor No: PRS06168

Representation ID: REP07292 Question Ref: H7

Dear Madam

Allocations Issues and Options Document - Sites 536 (Nook Farm) , 1330 B (Adjacent to Judes Pond), 1336 (Westerton Road, and 3373 A, B and C (Haigh Wood)

We act on behalf of the West Ardsley Consortium that has made formal comments to the Leeds Site Allocations Issues and Options documents. We enclose a copy of the Document submitted with the formal response for your information.

Our clients are interested in sites 536 (Nook Farm) , 1330 B (Adjacent to Judes Pond), 1336 (Westerton Road, and 3373 A, B and C (Haigh Wood) and have previously made representations for the sites to be allocated, along with a substantial area of ecologically maintained open space centred around the Haigh Wood area.

Having seen the draft proposals our clients are supportive in principle of the Councils approach to identifying a large portion of the land promoted by them for residential development. The areas identified as "Green" (for development) in the Issues and Options document at Haigh Wood amount to 16.83 Ha of land with a suggested dwelling capacity of over 400 units (at a reasonably low 25/Ha). The areas identified as "Red" (felt to be not suitable for development) amount to 17.5 Ha. This sets an approach of slightly over half the land being protected from development.

We note that the site known as Nook Farm (536) is an existing UDPR commitment and has no policy designation that has or would suggest anything other than its suitability for residential development. That site also has (contrary to the suggestion in the Issues and Options document) an extant planning permission. The details of this are set out in our formal representations.

Having reviewed the indicative boundaries suggested between the "Green" and "Red" sites in the Issues and Options document and undertaken a detailed assessment against trees, topography, the LNA of Haigh Wood and the stream running through it, whilst acknowledging the need for an uninterrupted green corridor separating the north west and south east areas of land, our clients are firmly of the view that the Councils preliminary work does not produce appropriate boundaries between development allocations and non development allocations. For example as figure 3 in the attached document shows land is identified by the Council for development in site 3373A that includes part of the LNA, the trees of Haigh Wood and the stream running through it, whilst seeking to protect from development land to the south east which has none of those considerations applying to it.

Utilising the work already done on ecology, trees and hedges, landscape and topography, our Clients have carefully considered the Councils objectives and aspirations from the comments in the tables and pro formas associated with the Issues and Options document. They have produced a revised masterplan and from that been able to identify appropriate development and allocation boundaries. These maintain a broad green corridor through the valley, protecting ecological interests, trees and the stream as well as views and the "open feel" of the valley itself. In particular this has not only widened the broad swathe of green between the development areas, compared to the earlier 2012 masterplan, but removed any road connections across the valley.

The resultant masterplan has been informed by all the Consortium team's professional disciplines and the changed highways connections fully evaluated to ensure they work appropriately.

The outcome is that of the area in the UDPR that is identified as NI 1 (some 36.14 Ha) only 40% is now proposed for development. The suggested allocations (boundaries shown in red on Figure 6 of the attached document include (so that the allocations are not excessively subdivided) substantial green corridors and strategic planting, amounting to some 3.24Ha. These run along the existing and proposed pedestrian and bridleway access corridors to the valley and the Wood. The suggested total area of the allocations (including the 3.24 Ha of undeveloped green space) is under half of the current NI1 land at 17.66 Ha. We believe this provides the right balance of development and protection of the wider site.

We note that the areas identified as "Green" in the Issues and Options document in this Outer South West area are insufficient by some margin (1,432) to meet the Core Strategy suggested proportion of housing for the area, even taking into account (and not questioning) the amount of development to come forward from permissions and existing allocations. There should be no doubt that all "Green" sites should therefore go forward for allocation. Indeed more will need to be found from "Amber" or even "Red" sites to provide sufficient land. In addition, there are proportionately far fewer "Green" sites (compared to "Amber") in East and West Ardsley than there are in Morley or the rest of the Outer South West.

The site at Haigh Wood with its non greenbelt status and accessibility and sustainability credentials provides a very good location for development and the provision of material environmental benefits through protection, increased access and environmental management of the Wood itself. As there have to be exceptional circumstances to take land out of the greenbelt, there must correspondingly be exceptional circumstances not to develop at Haigh Wood ahead of greenbelt land.

For all of these reasons our clients, look forward to working with the Council to bring forward development in line with the attached revised masterplan, which we believe fully addresses all comments made in the Issues and Options document and the related proformas about the land at Haigh Wood.

Yours faithfully

[x]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Gillian, Paul, Sophie And George Carrigill

Representor No: PRS06230

Representation ID: REP07138 Question Ref: H1

No site ref given - assume sites 3373A, B, C

I would like to object to the land at the top of Hill top Lane West Ardsley being allocated for housing, My main concern is the junction coming out of Hill top Lane onto Batley road which already is a hazard, it is a T junction with houses directly facing the end of Hill Top Lane, and the residents park their cars directly in front of their properties. this makes the narrow road even narrower, cars coming up Haybeck lane have a blind corner and some come at terrific speed, there are children crossing at school times and I have witnessed many near misses. Speed cameras, sleeping policemen and SLOW DOWN signs are needed already to prevent the inevitable happening. People Park on Hill Top Lane to drop children off at Hill Top School and Pick up, on both sides of the road, this causes access problems for residents.

The school is only 200 yards from the end of Hill Top Lane. Hill Top School is full to capacity, so unless the buildings are for elderly residents where would the children go to school? Our Local Doctors already have 17,000 patients and are not increasing the number of GP's, I know this as I work within the practice. Children play on Hill top lane on bikes and skate boards, and increased traffic would put a stop to that, it's quiet and safe at present, childrens freedom to play outside their homes in safety has to be considered.

The natural habitat enjoyed by birds, wildlife, walkers, dog walkers and children playing in Haigh Moor woods would be destroyed. The noise, dirt, and heavy plant traffic during development would have a massive affect on residents, especially the elderly who live in the bungalows on the left hand side. who ever has brain stormed this idea wants to come and spend an hour at the bottom of Hill Top lane one school morning and witness the chaos and danger there, we as residents are already inconvenienced greatly by the increased traffic since the School was built.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: JI Dixon-parker

Representor No: PRS06245

Representation ID: REP07156 Question Ref: H1

The proposed site at 3373A is the site used for the bi-annual gypsy, Roma and traveller horse fair- Lee Gap Fair. This is the oldest horse fair in the country granted under Royal Charter by King Stephen in 1136- so now being in its 877th year. Insufficient consideration has been given to the impact of these proposals on this important part of gypsy, Roma and traveller heritage and it would be completely unacceptable to take away the ability for the travellers from all over the UK and beyond to meet on this land and particularly so when Leeds City Council themselves have taken a keen interest in the fair and the welfare of the travellers who attend.

Representation ID: REP07156 Question Ref: H1

Loss of Greenbelt and Open Spaces.

It is Government policy that greenbelt should be used only in exceptional circumstances. There are no such exceptional circumstances to warrant building on the greenbelt and open areas on the sites above. The areas of Tingley and West Ardsley have already lost too many fields and hedgerows to private developers.

Building on sites 3373A and 3373C would adversely impact upon the openness of the central valley overlooking Baghill, across Haigh Wood and to the open countryside beyond.

The views of Arthington Close and The Upper Greens across the valley would be totally impeded by the proposed building of 130 homes.

The proposals would damage the biodiversity of the area - Haigh Wood is an ancient bluebell woodland with very established trees and hedgerows a beck and wide variety of animal and birdlife. The suggestion (by the Council) that if the proposed buildings went ahead that a green open/play space could be created in the middle of the new estate to allow a green area is frankly ludicrous- to preserve the green areas, the site should simply not be built upon at all.

Also, we believe that insufficient consideration has been given to the analysis of brownfield sites within the wider Leeds city area and particularly the Outer South West areas. Although it is recognised that these sites can be more expensive to develop and may not be in such financially lucrative areas it is the responsibility of the Council to look towards long term regeneration of the city as a whole and work with developers to bring about change. Cherry picking high value areas at the expense of open countryside is morally wrong and as a landowner with significant assets the Council needs to identify alternative sites throughout this area and the city.

There are an estimated 5000 empty houses in the city and we would challenge the Council as to what steps are being taken to bring these back into use. Furthermore, we understand that the Council itself controls significant brownfield assets throughout the city and council is duty bound and morally bound to put these forward for consideration in advance of greenbelt land being used. The proposals for the above numbered sites are financial gain at the expense of the environment and a precedent for further urban sprawl and encroachment of the countryside. The proposals are totally contrary to the greenbelt review methodology

Representation ID: REP07156 Question Ref: H1

ocal Amenities and Infrastructure.

The inclusion of the sites above when combined with the building which has already taken place and those sites where planning permission has already been granted would result in an unacceptable level of over intensification and have a disastrous impact on local GP surgeries and schools in the immediate area. There is only one GP Practice serving the area and it is oversubscribed with waiting time for an appointment currently running at 3 weeks. This is already unacceptable based on the current number of houses in the area. There is one dental practice with no vacancies for new patients and all local schools are oversubscribed with local children already unable to attend their local schools. The addition of more houses would only cause further problems.

Representation ID: REP07156 Question Ref: H1

Highways and Access.

It is likely that the site at 3373A would be accessed via The Upper Greens and although this is a "traditional" estate structure, the roads are comparatively narrow and winding and were not designed to accommodate such high numbers of housing exiting onto Westerton Road.

The existing highway infrastructure is unable to cope with current usage. There is serious congestion particularly around rush hours and school hours. The junction with Westerton Road is poor and directly opposite a primary school and a zebra crossing. Further, the close proximity of Arthington Close (a couple of hundred yards in one direction) and the very busy junction of Hesketh Lane (a couple of hundred yards in the other direction) mean that these are too close, are dangerous and any increase in traffic would compound what is already a very problematic area and would put children at risk.

Also the road and footpaths along Westerton Road are already in a very poor state of repair and not properly maintained by the Council.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 1 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if these sites would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. Significant developer contributions will be required at these sites to improve the public transport to meet the council LDF accessibility policies; particularly in the larger sites should these be brought forward for development. These include SHLAA ref: 2062, 1032, 1046, 1017 & 1055.

Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small sites low capacity are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

The table also includes accessibility assessments results to access other services and facilities within acceptable journey times on public transport.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H1

Disagree with Council's green assessment, think the site should be red

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H1

Disagree with Council's green assessment, think the site should be red

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Joanne Young

Representor No: PRS07143

Representation ID: REP08297 Question Ref: H1

Reason for change from Green to Red - Additional Information — Site 3373A Haighwell Map 33

1. Damage to Haigh Wood, other tress and wildlife.

a. Our property is next to the 3373A site and we have all types of wildlife enter our garden throughout the year from fox's, hedgehogs, squirrels and fogs but the most regular of all are the Bats which during the spring and summer months can be seen circling the trees between site 3373A and our garden. The number of Bats which can be seen seem to vary but they can be seen most nights throughout the summer from about 22:00hrs which is I when my wife and I tend to sit and watch them. The regularity of these Bats together with the close proximity in which they circle would suggest that the roost would most probably be within the 3373A site. As I'm sure you will be fully aware making planning decisions without the due consideration of priority species is contrary to the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 which applies to all public organisations, including local authorities. S.40 of the Act states "Every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity." Under s.41 of the Act, bats are listed by Defra as a priority species for the conservation of biodiversity.

b. The site itself includes part of a Tree Preservation Order area.

c. With development of the 3373A & 1336 sites would mean the complete enclosure of the already mainly secluded valley and would therefore suggest that LDF actually changes the area by extending the area of protection.

2. Agriculture

a. Site 3373A is currently used as agriculture and therefore I would question why it is not a viable option for this to be maintained.

3. Inadequacy of access roads.

a. Access to the site would have to be either on to the main Westerton Road via site 1336 Map 33 or by extending the current Upper Green Drive.

i. If an entry via site 1336 was considered I would question the viability regards safety of the said junction as it would need to join Westerton road straight after the bend when approaching towards Westerton School.

ii. If the entry was via extending Upper Green Drive I would then propose that this is a potential threat to children's safety by increasing the volume of traffic that would enter the existing development via the single entry directly opposite Westerton school which is already heavily congested at school opening and closing times.

The width of the current developments roads on Upper Green would also be questionable as to whether they would be safe with a higher volume of traffic as currently cars can not pass comfortably without taking avoiding action.

4. School Capacities

a. Westerton — the Head of Westerton has already confirmed in writing that the school is already at maximum capacity moving into the next several years.

b. Blackgates — This school has already been enlarged and again the Head has confirmed that they are also at maximum capacity once again.

c. Woodkirk — Once again it is my belief that the Head of Woodkirk is of the opinion that the school is at capacity therefore with the school being fed by Westerton and Blackgates (amongst others) how would they possibly cope with additional children in the area?

5. Other Community Facilities

a. Would other facilities such as doctors and dentists etc be overstretched by this increased population? Leigh View Medical practice has already been recently redeveloped therefore I would certainly question the potential risk with increase local population.

6. Character of the Area

a. With a development on the scale envisaged for site 3373A, particularly when combined with other existing developed sites in my opinion it does not "respect the character and objectives of the local communities" as quoted in paragraph 84 of the Plan Overview.

b. Have all of the brown belt sites been considered for their viability. Although brown belt sites tend to be more expensive to develop these must be higher on the development priority list to assist their regeneration and preserve green belts to maintain the character of the local areas.

C.

7. Are the wards in partnership with the potential proposals?

a. Site 1336 and most but not all of 3373A are in Ardsley and Robin Hood ward however the remainder of 3373A and most of the residents who would be effected live in the Morley South ward.

8. Viability of developing site 3373A

a. Parts of this site have serious variations in its levels with steep slopes, potential instability caused by mining (there is a bell pit at the end of Upper Green Way) and possible restrictions from a former landfill site. In reality would the use of this site

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Joanne Young

Representor No: PRS07143

really result in the most efficient, effective and commercially viable use of a current green belt area?

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Hilary Cooper

Representor No: PRS07144

Representation ID: REP08298 Question Ref: H1

Reason for change from Green to Red - Additional Information — Site 3373A Haighwell Map 33

1. Damage to Haigh Wood, other tress and wildlife.

a. Our property is next to the 3373A site and we have all types of wildlife enter our garden throughout the year from fox's, hedgehogs, squirrels and fogs but the most regular of all are the Bats which during the spring and summer months can be seen circling the trees between site 3373A and our garden. The number of Bats which can be seen seem to vary but they can be seen most nights throughout the summer from about 22:00hrs which is I when my wife and I tend to sit and watch them. The regularity of these Bats together with the close proximity in which they circle would suggest that the roost would most probably be within the 3373A site. As I'm sure you will be fully aware making planning decisions without the due consideration of priority species is contrary to the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 which applies to all public organisations, including local authorities. S.40 of the Act states "Every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity." Under s.41 of the Act, bats are listed by Defra as a priority species for the conservation of biodiversity.

b. The site itself includes part of a Tree Preservation Order area.

c. With development of the 3373A & 1336 sites would mean the complete enclosure of the already mainly secluded valley and would therefore suggest that LDF actually changes the area by extending the area of protection.

2. Av ;culture

a. Site 3373A is currently used as agriculture and therefore I would question why it is not a viable option for this to be maintained.

3. Inadequacy of access roads.

a. Access to the site would have to be either on to the main Westerton Road via site 1336 Map 33 or by extending the current Upper Green Drive.

i. If an entry via site 1336 was considered I would question the viability regards safety of the said junction as it would need to join Westerton road straight after the bend when approaching towards Westerton School.

ii. If the entry was via extending Upper Green Drive I would then propose that this is a potential threat to children's safety by increasing the volume of traffic that would enter the existing development via the single entry directly opposite Westerton school which is already heavily congested at school opening and closing times.

iii. The width of the current developments roads on Upper Green would also be questionable as to whether they would be safe with a higher volume of traffic as currently cars can not pass comfortably without taking avoiding action_

4. School Capacities

a. Westerton — the Head of Westerton has already confirmed in writing that the school is already at maximum capacity moving into the next several years.

b. Blackgates — This school has already been enlarged and again the Head has confirmed that they are also at maximum capacity once again_

c. Woodkirk — Once again it is my belief that the Head of Woodkirk is of the opinion that the school is at capacity therefore with the school being fed by Westerton and Blackgates (amongst others) how would they possibly cope with additional children in the area?

5. Other Community Facilities

a. Would other facilities such as doctors and dentists etc be overstretched by this increased population? Leigh View Medical practice has already been recently redeveloped therefore I would certainly question the potential risk with increase local population.

6. Character of the Area

a. With a development on the scale envisaged for site 3373A, particularly when combined with other existing developed sites in my opinion it does not "respect the character and objectives of the local communities" as quoted in paragraph 84 of the Plan Overview.

b. Have all of the brown belt sites been considered for their viability. Although brown belt sites tend to be more expensive to develop these must be higher on the development priority list to assist their regeneration and preserve green belts to maintain the character of the local areas.

C.

7. Are the wards in partnership with the potential proposals?

a. Site 1336 and most but not all of 3373A are in Ardsley and Robin Hood ward however the remainder of 3373A and most of the residents who would be effected live in the Morley South ward.

8. Viability of developing site 3373A

a. Parts of this site have serious variations in its levels with steep slopes, potential instability caused by mining (there is a bell pit at the end of Upper Green Way) and possible restrictions from a former landfill site. In reality would the use of this site

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373A

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Hilary Cooper

Representor No: PRS07144

really result in the most efficient, effective and commercially viable use of a current green belt area?

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373B

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: E Thornton

Representor No: PRS00309

Representation ID: REP02250 Question Ref: H7

School capacities, woodkirk already oversubscribed.

Name: S Milner

Representor No: PRS01004

Representation ID: REP03053 Question Ref: H7

3373b Tingley - Red

Not enough schools or local amenities to support this site

Name: Caroline Proctor

Representor No: PRS02096

Representation ID: REP04315 Question Ref: H7

3373B – This should be designated green belt not open land. As stated in the summary of the of the SLP this is an important open space and should be protected and access maintained – through fields not built up areas, to keep the openness.

Name: Annie McNally

Representor No: PRS03059

Representation ID: REP00387 Question Ref: G1

I think it is disgusting that the council are wanting to build on greenbelt land on proposed Plots 1336, 3373, 3372, 3373A, 3373B, 3373C, 1330B, 1330A, 536. And 3456A. It is an area of outstanding beauty where people enjoy walking, running, playing and riding horses. Many wild animals live in the fields and to take it away would turn this area into a concrete jungle. It would mean my view at the back would be eradicated, lowering the value of my house, but more importantly the pleasure I have everyday when I look across the field. This city needs green areas where we can walk and get away from the stresses of life. Also, to the rear of my property there is bindweed in the field which I believe would make it difficult for any developers to be able to build on that land. There are plenty of brown field sites which can be developed. Do not take away our green spaces. Totally outrageous.

Name: Stephen Wild

Representor No: PRS03279

Representation ID: REP00620 Question Ref: H2

3373C. This is a green field site. It is, physically, green fields. Access will not be sufficient if it is intended to use Hill Top Lane, which is already congested with resident parking. Local schools are already full, and services for local residents (shops etc) are poor - additional housing will not help. The distinction between 3373C and 3373B seems arbitrary: in open character of the countryside around Haigh Wood is part of the landscape as much worth preserving as the woods themselves.

Name: Michael Short

Representor No: PRS03336

Representation ID: REP00155 Question Ref: H7

3373B-Part of peaceful wooded valley-widely used local amenity.

Representation ID: REP00155 Question Ref: H9

Parts of 3373A which are immediately adjacent to the wood in 3373B. Parts of this are in what local people consider to be the wood.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373B

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Richard Sagar

Representor No: PRS03405

Representation ID: REP01941 Question Ref: H1

Whilst we are in broad agreement with the designation of green sites at Haigh Wood in the Outer South West area of Leeds, we have concerns regarding the boundaries between the "green" and "red" sites. We agree with and support the allocation of land at Haigh Wood for housing with a central area in the vicinity of Haigh Wood LNA left undisturbed, but feel that this primary objective can be better achieved with different boundaries to sites 3373A, 3373B, 3373C and 1336

Representation ID: REP01941 Question Ref: H3

As a corollary to the explanation provided at H2 and in the attached document, we suggest that parts of site 3373B be re-designated as green, in accordance with Figure 6 and Appendix 1 of that document. These sections are in areas which are not needed to be kept undeveloped for the preservation of the green corridor between the two development parcels. New access points, via Upper Green Avenue/Upper Green Way and a new junction onto Westerton Road will facilitate improved integration into the transport network. As mentioned above, the alignment of site 3373B would be more logical if it followed the suggested revised indicative masterplan included in the attached document (at Figure 6 and Appendix 1). The green corridor will be further protected by the removal of the previously suggested vehicular link road between the two parts of the Haigh Wood site. The new alignment will preserve the vast majority of the hedges and existing trees on the site, whilst allowing a more logical and achievable layout for future development. Additionally, no development is proposed within the vicinity of the LNA or the stream running down the valley.

Representation ID: REP01941 Question Ref: H8

As explained at H3 and in the attached documents, we believe that sections of site 3373B should be re-designated as green, instead of parts of site 1336 and 3373A.

Representation ID: REP01941 Question Ref: H9

As explained at H2 and in the attached documents, we suggest that parts of sites 1336 and 3373A would be more suitable for colour coding as red, whilst parts of site 3373B should be green.

Representation ID: REP01941 Question Ref: H11

The suggested revised allocations at Haigh Wood (see Figure 6 and Appendix 1 of the attached document) ("green" land) are all suitable for short term delivery.

Representation ID: REP01941 Question Ref: H2

We agree with the Council that the central valley at Haigh Wood should be excluded from development, as a green corridor between proposed development sites. This was the Council's intention in designating site 3373B as red. However, the alignment of the valley suggested by site 3373B does not accurately reflect the topography of the area, the trees, the stream and the LNA and how these will affect potential development, nor does it align with what we suggest is the true extent of the central valley. We therefore suggest that sections of sites 3373A and 1336 be re-designated as red, in accordance with the attached documents (Document for Residential and Open Space Allocation Addendum dated July 2013, in particular Figure 6 and Appendix 1, and the covering letter) outlining the detailed justification for our proposed new alignment for the central valley. The sections of sites 3373A and 1336 which we suggest are re-designated as red are not suitable for development, as they incorporate important arboricultural features which will be difficult to incorporate into a housing development and are best left as part of the green corridor between the two development parcels. Conversely, parts of site 3373B should be added as green, not red, for similar reasons, but in reverse; the area can be developed without harm to what is sought to be protected, as further explained below.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373B

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Camille Leach

Representor No: PRS03615

Representation ID: REP00848 Question Ref: H1

sites 3373A, 3373B, 3365,1258,site 1330B 464 houses in such a small vicinity is unsustainable, there are currently just over 300 pupils at Hill Top Primary School with no room for any expansion, the school is full and the same is true of Westerton. Leeds City Council have in their allocation plan confirmed that Ardsley and Robin Hood have a deficiency in parks and gardens (the only area in Leeds South West to be deficient)natural greenspace should be used to reduce the deficit and improve our community. Our GP surgeries are at breaking point the surgery at Leigh View was recently extended and it's difficult to envisage how this could be extended further.Further erosion of the demarcation between West Ardsley & Tingley – , the two areas will be barely distinguishable from each other which is contrary to the Councils policy SP1 which clearly states smaller Settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlement's size, function and sustainability. If these plans were approved it will no doubt result in urban sprawl with no identifiable boundaries. Our fields provide a public amenity development would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This view was endorsed by the Secretary of State in their past decision letter.Our road network was not built to support the existing volume of traffic , we do not have the infrastructure to support development of this scale, our public transport links are very poor with only one bus an hour into Leeds, the only viable means of transportation is by car which will have a cumulative impact on the A650 and A653 which are already congested.

Representation ID: REP00848 Question Ref: H9

site 3373A and 3373c should be coded red for all the issues previously stated plus site 3373A Lee gap Fair is held twice a year in these fields, the fair is the oldest horse fair in England dating back to 1136 and forms part of the history and heritage of the area.site 3373C It can be argued that the highways infrastructure for Site 3373B is inadequate, there are Highways concerns re poor accessibility for the number of houses proposed and then there is the issue of Highways safety with the junction of Hilltop Lane being within 100 metres of the primary school.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373B

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Camille Leach

Representor No: PRS03615

Representation ID: REP00848

Question Ref: General comment

Site 3373C Objections1. Local character and identityDevelopment of this site would be contrary to the following sections of the Council's policy SP1 in the Core Strategy:1. SP1 (i) states: "Smaller Settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlement's size, function and sustainability." Site 3373A, with its estimated capacity of 130 dwellings, does not have regard to the size, function and sustainability of West Ardsley.SP1 (iii) states: "For development to respect and enhance the local character and identity of places and neighbourhoods". The local character and identity of West Ardsley would be seriously threatened by 3373a, 3373C and 1336, and would make its component areas of Upper Green, Haigh Moor and Hill Top barely distinguishable from each other.My view accords with three decision letters from the Planning Inspectorate which were used in the Council's own evidence to the Unitary Development Plan public inquiry in 1995. In paragraph 39 of his report on the Morley Local Plan, the inspector considered that the planned development at Haigh Wood (site WA2H) would have a "very serious impact upon the character and environment of West Ardsley". He concluded in paragraph 10: "In the past, development in the Morley area would appear to have been sporadic and opportunist, placing the identity of the smaller settlements at risk and tending towards the creation of amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the length of the A650 Bradford to Wakefield road. In my view, the further diffusion of the existing loosely-knit settlement pattern should, as far as possible, be resisted."Considering appeals in 1986 on 81/23/00212 and 81/23/00213 (broadly the same area as LDF sites 3373A/B/C and 1336) the inspector said "It would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This was endorsed in the Secretary of State's decision letter.In 1994, a third inspector dismissed an appeal to develop land at Arthington Close near the the edge of Haigh Wood because it would "unacceptably erode the fringe of this rural area and would lead to pressure for further encroachment of residential development, most particularly in the fields to the west..."Although some years have passed since these decisions, the character and environment of the area are still semi-rural and just as delicate. When cogent arguments have been repeatedly made against development of the 3373 areas by the Secretary of State, by three planning inspectors and by Leeds Council itself (in evidence to the UDP inquiry), there can be no justification for sites 3373A, 3373C and 1336 being pursued for residential development in the LDF. They should instead be reclassified as "red" and withdrawn from consideration for development when producing the next stage of the plan.2. Damage to Haigh Wood and Baghill beck valleyDevelopment of this site would be contrary to the Council's policy P12 in the Core Strategy:"The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes, including their historical and cultural significance, will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness through stewardship and the planning process." The secluded Haigh Wood valley comprises the central portion of site 3373A, including part of the wood covered by a Tree Preservation Order. Residential development would prejudice the objectives underlining this policy as set out in paragraphs 5.3.46 to 5.3.48 of the Core Strategy including: "The Council seeks to protect and enhance the varied landscapes of Leeds and the assets they contain, from valued local trees, the countryside to nationally designated landscape, fauna and flora". This view was endorsed by three planning inspectors and again in the Council's evidence, given by Mr G B Andrews, at the UDP inquiry. In his paragraph 4.3.6, Mr Andrews stated: I refer to the conclusions reached by the inspectors at the two subsequent appeal cases in 1985 and 1994. In each case it is acknowledged that the Haigh Wood area is of value as an area of attractive open farmland with a rural character and provides an important amenity in the local area". Even the Council's own assessment for the LDF states that the site is: "Not supported (RED). This site includes Haigh Wood and Baghill Beck Local Nature Area which fall under UK Biological Action Plan priority habitats - a mixture of woodland, scrub and grassland habitats alongside Baghill Beck. There are a number of wide hedgerow/woodland belts throughout the site that provide a valuable habitat. Water vole has been recorded on the Hey Beck. The Baghill Beck flows into this water course and could support this species. Bats to consider."3. FairnessThe Core Strategy seeks to be "fair". The word is used in paragraph 1.2 and again in 1.14. Yet the proposed green housing sites when taken together would definitely not be fair to West Ardsley and Tingley. No justification has been given as to why there is such a concentration here, nor any evidence of local need. Indeed, paragraph 4.6.14 states that "The SHMA 2011 was not able to identify any geographically specific need for new housing based on population growth." The sites seem to have been assessed individually rather than their cumulative impact. This impact is potentially very much greater when considered alongside Kirklees Council's proposals for the Chidswell area. 4. Highway access The Upper Green culs-de-sac and Hill Top Lane cul-de-sacs are not suitable to serve more houses. They would become much less safe for children to play in and the already severe dangers at school times would be exacerbated.5. SchoolsPrimary and secondary schools already full and difficult to expand further.6. Agricultural landGood quality agricultural land would be lost.7. ViabilityExtra costs from: a. parts of 3373A and 3373C have serious levels problems and look undevelopable; b. bell pits known to exist in the area from former mining; c. elimination of Japanese Knotweed.The site on Westerton Road from Regency Gardens to Westerton Wood if developed will see 117 new homes - this land is currently classed as green belt (site 3365 = 83 homes and site 1258 = 34 homes) development here will represent a major incursion into the Green belt and will create further pressure on Ardsley reservoir as a local beauty spot. Development of sites 3365 and 1258 will result in the loss of valuable agricultural land, there are a number of wide hedgerow and woodland belts throughout the site that provide a valuable habitat for wildlife in particular bats. Development of the sites on Westerton Road will result in the amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the whole length of the Westerton Road.Site 1330B is an extension of the building that is currently ongoing adjacent to Jude's pond - and is for a further 32 houses ! This site has major highways access issues and has less than the recommended visibility splay for highways safety - further development of this site will exasperate current problems regarding drainage on the land - Haigh Moor Road residents already have to deal with flooding of the pavements and highways in the vicinity of Jude's pond. 464 houses in such a small vicinity is unsustainable, there are currently just over 300 pupils at Hill Top Primary School with no room for any expansion, the school is full and the same is true of Westerton which as you know was a small village school 20 years ago but is now one of the biggest primary schools in the Leeds district and all because of the amount of building that has taken place over recent years.Leeds City Council have in their allocation plan confirmed that Ardsley and Robin Hood have a deficiency in parks and gardens (the only area in Leeds South West to be deficient) - our children already have very little designated play areas, they have also confirmed that we are deficient in outdoor sports areas and facilities for children to play. We have however got a surplus of natural green space which is currently under threat of housing - if this natural greenspace is to be used for any purpose, surely it should be used to reduce the deficit and improve our community. Further reduction of amenity greenspace in an area which is seeing more and more housing development is unfair and unsustainable.Our GP surgeries are at breaking point with current waiting times for appointments being in excess of two weeks, the surgery at Leigh View was recently extended and it's difficult to envisage how this could be extended further to serve the population boom that will ensue if all these sites are developed.Further erosion of the demarcation between West Ardsley & Tingley - soon the two settlements will merge into one and West Ardsley as a separate community will be subsumed into its near neighbour, the two areas will be barely distinguishable from each other which is contrary to the Councils policy SP1 which clearly states smaller Settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlement's size, function and sustainability. If these plans were approved it will no doubt result in urban sprawl with no identifiable boundaries.Our fields provide a public amenity for dog-walkers, cyclists, ramblers and local residents alike and It would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This view was endorsed by the Secretary of State in their past decision letter.Our road network was not built to support the existing volume of traffic , we do not have the infrastructure to support development of this scale, our public transport links are very poor with only one bus an hour into Leeds, the only viable means of transportation is by car which will have a cumulative impact on the A650 and A653 which are already congested.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373B

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Camille Leach

Representor No: PRS03615

Representation ID: REP00848 Question Ref: H2

Objections to 3373a and 3373c Development of these sites would be contrary to SP1 in the Core Strategy: SP1 (i) No regard to the size, function and sustainability of West Ardsley. SP1 (iii) The local character and identity of West Ardsley would be seriously threatened by 3373A, 3373C and 1336, and would make the areas of Upper Green, Haigh Moor and Hill Top undistinguishable from each other. Three decision letters from the Planning Inspectorate which were used in the Council's own evidence to the UDP in 1995. In paragraph 39 of his report he considered the planned development concluding "In the past, development in the Morley area would appear to have been sporadic and opportunist, placing the identity of the smaller settlements at risk and tending towards the creation of amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the length of the A650. In my view, the further diffusion of the existing loosely-knit settlement pattern should be resisted." Appeals in 1986 on 81/23/00212 and 81/23/00213 the inspector said "It would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This was endorsed in the Secretary of State's decision letter. When cogent arguments have been repeatedly made against development of the 3373 areas by the Secretary of State, by three planning inspectors and by Leeds Council itself (in evidence to the UDP inquiry), there can be no justification for sites 3373A, 3373C and 1336 being pursued for residential development in the LDF. They should instead be reclassified as "red". Development of these sites would be contrary to the Council's policy P12 in the Core Strategy: The secluded Haigh Wood valley comprises the central portion of site 3373A, including part of the wood covered by a Tree Preservation Order. Residential development would prejudice the objectives underlining this policy as set out in paragraphs 5.3.46 to 5.3.48 of the Core Strategy.

Name: Roy Wagstaff

Representor No: PRS04064

Representation ID: REP01469 Question Ref: H2

Site Reference MAP 33, 3373 A-C. Access problems by increased road traffic to Hill Top Lane/Batley Road. Road safety concerns as access to site is close to primary school and on a bad bend. Access also affected by parked vehicles outside residences directly opposite Hill Top Lane. Ability of local services to cope with extra residents attending local schools and doctors surgeries; personal experience over last six years of just getting a routine doctors appointment has gone from two days to two weeks, due to previous developments in the area. Loss of these areas reduces public access to less formal recreational space and traffic free footpaths. These developments would undoubtedly have an impact on the local wildlife in Haigh Moor Wood. (eg. Bats).

Name: Robin Colvill

Representor No: PRS04071

Representation ID: REP01143 Question Ref: H1

Hill Top Lane is a lane not a wide road and would not be able to take the traffic for another 120 houses, the schools are all over full children are having to travel out of the area. wildlife, bats etc would be affected in the close by woods, walkers would not have the amenity anymore, the doctors surgery cannot handle the patients they have now with sometimes 3 weeks waiting for an appointment, road safety is a major concern as school time is a nightmare on Hill top lane with double parked cars already. Even if another exit on to Haigh moor rd were to be made that in itself would cause even more problems as Haigh moor rd is constantly full of parked cars on both sides and a real hazard to negotiate. we are not talking about a small number of homes which would probably be ok but the amount of homes is far beyond the amount that the area can accommodate, I strongly disagree with any building on this field [x]

Representation ID: REP01143 Question Ref: H5

map 31 site 3373 A-C

Representation ID: REP01143 Question Ref: H6

for reasons already given in previous question

Representation ID: REP01143 Question Ref: H8

map31 site 3373 A-C for reasons already listed in previous 2 questions

Representation ID: REP01143 Question Ref: H9

map31 site 3373 A-C for reasons already listed in previous 2 questions

Representation ID: REP01143 Question Ref: H2

map31 site 3373 A-C

Name: Christine Leach

Representor No: PRS04208

Representation ID: REP01169 Question Ref: H7

3373b Access to this area would be extremely difficult

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373B

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Sue Baker

Representor No: PRS04274

Representation ID: REP01764 Question Ref: G1

The suggestion to develop the area around Haigh Wood in West Ardsley is detrimental to the wood. This is a natural bluebell wood which is rare in this area. Increasing housing in close proximity will destroy the natural habitat. The area around West Ardsley reservoir is a prime example of over use by the local population and as such access will probably have to be closed due to damage. The same thing will happen to the wood as there will be even less greenspace for leisure. Part of the area is also covered by a mediaeval charter to allow Lee Fair to meet on the land yearly.

Name: Michael Heath

Representor No: PRS04344

Representation ID: REP02081 Question Ref: G1

I wish to make reference to the LDP, map 31 site 3373A-C in that I have concerns re access problems by increased traffic; road safety concerns as we are close to the school; the ability of local services to cope in the event of a large influx of people; the loss of identity for the village (which has already had a vast number of additional houses in the last 10/15 years) and damage to wildlife in Haigh Moor Wood, if there is development such as proposed in this Plan.

Representation ID: REP02081 Question Ref: General comment

I wish to make reference to the LDP, map 31 site 3373A-C in that I have concerns re access problems by increased traffic; road safety concerns as we are close to the school; the ability of local services to cope in the event of a large influx of people; the loss of identity for the village (which has already had a vast number of additional houses in the last 10/15 years) and damage to wildlife in Haigh Moor Wood, if there is development such as proposed in this Plan.

Representation ID: REP02081 Question Ref: G7

I wish to make reference to the LDP, map 31 site 3373A-C in that I have concerns re access problems by increased traffic; road safety concerns as we are close to the school; the ability of local services to cope in the event of a large influx of people; the loss of identity for the village (which has already had a vast number of additional houses in the last 10/15 years) and damage to wildlife in Haigh Moor Wood, if there is development such as proposed in this Plan.

Name: Alison Brice

Representor No: PRS04365

Representation ID: REP00325 Question Ref: H2

Sites:3373a and 3373c (agree 3373b should be red) Also query 536 . With sites 3373a and c I am concerned about the access -if Hill Top Lane is used the road isn't wide and the junction with Batley Road has long been a concern. Cars park directly opposite the junction (terraced houses no drives) and on both sides of Hill Top Lane - especially of concern is school pick up and drop off parking - I am surprised there hasn't been a serious accident with children from Hill Top School and speed is also a concern. If more traffic on the road accessing or cutting through the risk is so much greater. The houses were built with covenants against hedges etc to preserve sight lines.

Name: Samantha Halls

Representor No: PRS04583

Representation ID: REP00646 Question Ref: H1

1. Local character and identityDevelopment of site would be contrary to the following sections of the Council's policy SP1 in the Core Strategy: - Site 3373A, with its estimated capacity of 130 dwellings, does not have regard to the size, function and sustainability of West Ardsley.SP1 (iii) states: "For development to respect and enhance the local character and identity of places and neighbourhoods". The local character and identity of West Ardsley would be seriously threatened by 3373A, especially when combined with sites 3373C and 1336, and would make its component areas of Upper Green, Haigh Moor and Hill Top barely distinguishable from each other.My view accords with three decision letters from the Planning Inspectorate which were used in the Council's own evidence to the Unitary Development Plan public inquiry in 1995. In paragraph 39 of his report on Morley Local Plan, the inspector considered the planned development at Haigh Wood (site WA2H) would have a "very serious impact upon the character and environment of West Ardsley". He concluded paragraph 10: "In the past, development in the Morley area would appear to have been sporadic and opportunist, placing smaller settlements at risk and tending towards the creation of amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the length of the A650 Bradford to Wakefield road. In my view, the further diffusion of the existing loosely-knit settlement pattern should, as far as possible, be resisted."Considering appeals in 1986 on 81/23/00212 and 81/23/00213 (broadly the same area as LDF sites 3373A/B/C and 1336) the inspector said "It would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This was endorsed in the Secretary of State's decision letter.In 1994, a third inspector dismissed an appeal to develop land at Arthington Close near the edge of Haigh Wood because it would "unacceptably erode the fringe of this rural area and lead to pressure for further encroachment of residential development, particularly in the fields to the west...".Although some years ago these decisions, the character and environment of the area are still semi-rural and just as delicate. When cogent arguments have been repeatedly made against development of the 3373 areas by the Secretary of State, by three planning inspectors and by Leeds Council itself (in evidence to the UDP inquiry), there can be no justification for sites 3373A, 3373C and 1336 being pursued for residential development in the LDF. They should instead be reclassified as "red" and withdrawn from consideration for development when producing the next stage of the plan.2.Damage to Haigh Wood and Baghill beck valley - Development of this site would be contrary to the Council's policy P12 in the Core Strategy:

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373B

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Susan Galvin

Representor No: PRS04623

Representation ID: REP01649 Question Ref: H5

3373a-c as above in h2

Representation ID: REP01649 Question Ref: H7

3373b -wildlife

Representation ID: REP01649 Question Ref: H9

3373c - proximity to protected wildlife on site 3373b and serious access and highways issues.

Representation ID: REP01649 Question Ref: H2

3373 a-c. Particularly site C at the top of hill top lane, through which access would be fed. This leads off Batley road which is very dangerous already, especially during school start and finish times when traffic is increased. The addition of 144houses, minumum 2 cars per house, would be hugely detrimental to road safety and heighten risk. In addition capacity of local amenities such as schools to cope is questionable. There has been considerable building of housing in recent years, and still continuing, but no increase in capacity of amenities. Site A has comments regarding wildlife in Haigh wood, and these comments should also apply to site C, particularly bats which fly regularly across site c.

Name: Saphena Hair

Representor No: PRS04827

Representation ID: REP00929 Question Ref: H1

Site at the end of Hill Top Lane WF3 should not be developed further.

Representation ID: REP00929 Question Ref: H2

Field at the top of Hill Top Lane WF3.The village of West Ardsley has had too many new houses built in the recent years.The field at the end of hill top lane has woods which is a nature reserve, there would be an adverse effect on the wildlife.The roads around here are not adequate for more traffic.West Ardsley is a village which is fast diisappearing and merging into Tingley.

Name: Geoffrey Barker

Representor No: PRS05093

Representation ID: REP05661 Question Ref: H1

we wish to register our protest as to the proposed building of New houses at the fields at the end of Hill Top Lane, Tingley WF3 1HT.

the reasons are -- 1 destruction of woodland, wild -life habitat.

2 increased traffic a danger to residents, especially to children

3 access from Batley Road would be dangerous , due to bad bend in Batley road

4 near to school, increased traffic a danger for school children

5 parking on road a problem now for school attenders, would be worse if road upgraded

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373B

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Andrea Heibel

Representor No: PRS05109

Representation ID: REP05689 Question Ref: H7

Please note my objections to the proposed developments below.
The proposal for site 3373A (This is the site that runs from the top of Baghill around the back of Arthington Close and Upper Green and will finish on Westerton Road opposite Lonsdale Rise) is to build 130 houses. Lee gap Fair is held twice a year in these fields, the fair is the oldest horse fair in England dating back to 1136 and forms part of the history and heritage of the area.
The 3373C site which will run from the top of Hilltop Lane and carve up all the fields from there to Nook Green on Haigh Moor Road is for 144 houses. It can be argued that the highways infrastructure for Site 3373B is inadequate, there are Highways concerns re poor accessibility for the number of houses proposed and then there is the issue of Highways safety with the junction of Hilltop Lane being within 100 metres of the primary school. All the issues on the attached letter are also relevant for site 3773C.
The site on Westerton Road from Regency Gardens to Westerton Wood if developed will see 117 new homes - this land is currently classed as green belt (site 3365 = 83 homes and site 1258 = 34 homes) development here will represent a major incursion into the Green belt and will create further pressure on Ardsley reservoir as a local beauty spot.
Development of sites 3365 and 1258 will result in the loss of valuable agricultural land, there are a number of wide hedgerow and woodland belts throughout the site that provide a valuable habitat for wildlife in particular bats.
Development of the sites on Westerton Road will result in the amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the whole length of the Westerton Road.
Site 1330B is an extension of the building that is currently ongoing adjacent to Jude's pond - and is for a further 32 houses ! This site has major highways access issues and has less than the recommended visibility splay for highways safety - further development of this site will exasperate current problems regarding drainage on the land - Haigh Moor Road residents already have to deal with flooding of the pavements and highways in the vicinity of Jude's pond.
Please note that all these sites are in addition to any planning applications that have already been approved.
464 houses in such a small vicinity is unsustainable, there are currently just over 300 pupils at Hill Top Primary School with no room for any expansion, the school is full and the same is true of Westerton which as you know was a small village school 20 years ago but is now one of the biggest primary schools in the Leeds district and all because of the amount of building that has taken place over recent years.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373B

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Andrea Heibel

Representor No: PRS05109

Leeds City Council have in their allocation plan confirmed that Ardsley and Robin Hood have a deficiency in parks and gardens (the only area in Leeds South West to be deficient) - our children already have very little designated play areas, they have also confirmed that we are deficient in outdoor sports areas and facilities for children to play. We have however got a surplus of natural green space which is currently under threat of housing - if this natural greenspace is to be used for any purpose, surely it should be used to reduce the deficit and improve our community. Further reduction of amenity greenspace in an area which is seeing more and more housing development is unfair and unsustainable. Our GP surgeries are at breaking point with current waiting times for appointments being in excess of two weeks, the surgery at Leigh View was recently extended and it's difficult to envisage how this could be extended further to serve the population boom that will ensue if all these sites are developed. Further erosion of the demarcation between West Ardsley & Tingley - soon the two settlements will merge into one and West Ardsley as a separate community will be subsumed into its near neighbour, the two areas will be barely distinguishable from each other which is contrary to the Councils policy SP1 which clearly states smaller Settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlement's size, function and sustainability. If these plans were approved it will no doubt result in urban sprawl with no identifiable boundaries. Our fields provide a public amenity for dog-walkers, cyclists, ramblers and local residents alike and It would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This view was endorsed by the Secretary of State in their past decision letter. Our road network was not built to support the existing volume of traffic , we do not have the infrastructure to support development of this scale, our public transport links are very poor with only one bus an hour into Leeds, the only viable means of transportation is by car which will have a cumulative impact on the A650 and A653 which are already congested. I look forward to your response and confirmation that these developments will not go ahead

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373B

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Lynsey Morris

Representor No: PRS05111

Representation ID: REP05692 Question Ref: H7

Hi,

I would like to object against the planning proposals for the following sites on Map 33 (off Westerton Road)

1336

3373B

3373A

1330B

33732

3365

3373C

3456A

3456B

1258

I suggest that these should all be changed to RED due to the following reasons:

Too much traffic already so roads will be extremely busy right outside my front door. I have young children and will be scared for their safety.

Services such as Doctors surgery's, dentists, local hospitals, schools, supermarkets already too busy so won't be able to cope

Less water will be absorbed into the ground resulting in more flooding in our gardens.

This is currently already happening in several houses on Westerton Road including mine.

There are bats, foxes, owls, frogs, newts and many birds living in the area especially on sites 1336, 3373A, 3373B, 3373C. Should these not be protected?

House prices for homeowners in the area already will decrease.

We moved to the area because of the greenery and our view will be spoilt.

The sewerage system in place on Westerton Road recently failed causing waste from the sewers to overflow into nearby houses. This was due to the recent housing developments that have recently been built nearby so the sewerage system was unable to cope. This could very likely happen again.

Name: D, M, S Johnson And Kenny

Representor No: PRS05119

Representation ID: REP05702 Question Ref: H1

Firstly I would like to express my disappointment and embarrassment towards the councils plans for the proposed plans listed below. I understand the reason behind the lack of communication with the residents in the area may be beneficial to the local council and certain government groups. It obviously cuts down on man hours and paperwork.

I would like to object against the planning proposals for the following sites on Map 33 (off Westerton Road)

1336

3373B

3373A

1330B

33732

3365

3373C

3456A

3456B

1258

The infrastructure in this area will struggle to cope with the demands of the services required.

The area is attracting wildlife not seen in built up areas. It seems a shame to disregard the wildlife issue I'm sure if a full environmental survey of the area was to be carried out this would scupper the planning permission. But again that would be an extra cost to the council which would have an impact at year end when the books are balanced.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373B

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Ian Morris

Representor No: PRS05121

Representation ID: REP05700 Question Ref: H7

Firstly I would like to express my disappointment and embarrassment towards the councils plans for the proposed plans listed below. I understand the reason behind the lack of communication with the residents in the area may be beneficial to the local council and certain government groups. It obviously cuts down on man hours and paperwork.

I would like to object against the planning proposals for the following sites on Map 33 (off Westerton Road)

1336
3373B
3373A
1330B
33732
3365
3373C
3456A
3456B
1258

The infrastructure in this area will struggle to cope with the demands of the services required. The area is attracting wildlife not seen in built up areas. It seems a shame to disregard the wildlife issue I'm sure if a full environmental survey of the area was to be carried out this would scupper the planning permission. But again that would be an extra cost to the council which would have an impact at year end when the books are balanced.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373B

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Stephen Cowling

Representor No: PRS05177

Representation ID: REP05759 Question Ref: H4

I wish to object to 3373A, 3373B & 3373C.

[x]

I wish to object on the following grounds:

. The Haigh Wood site reference is 3373, and it is split into 3 parts:

. 3373A is land between Westerton Road & Haigh Wood. This has been assessed as suitable for residential development, with a capacity of 130 houses.

. 3373B is Haigh Wood itself. This has been assessed as unsuitable for residential development because of the topography of the site and access

. 3373C is the fields between Haigh Wood & Woollin Crescent, linking right round to Nook Farm.

The proposal for site 3373A (This is the site that runs from the top of Baghill around the back of Arthington Close and Upper Green and will finish on Westerton Road opposite Lonsdale Rise) is to build 130 houses. Lee gap Fair is held twice a year in these fields, the fair is the oldest horse fair in England dating back to 1136 and forms part of the history and heritage of the area.

The 3373C site which will run from the top of Hilltop Lane and carve up all the fields from there to Nook Green on Haigh Moor Road is for 144 houses. It can be argued that the highways infrastructure for Site 3373B is inadequate, there are Highways concerns re poor accessibility for the number of houses proposed and then there is the issue of Highways safety with the junction of Hilltop Lane being within 100 metres of the primary school. All the issues on the attached letter are also relevant for site 3373C.

The site on Westerton Road from Regency Gardens to Westerton Wood if developed will see 117 new homes - this land is currently classed as green belt (site 3365 = 83 homes and site 1258 = 34 homes) development here will represent a major incursion into the Green belt and will create further pressure on Ardsley reservoir as a local beauty spot. Development of sites 3365 and 1258 will result in the loss of valuable agricultural land, there are a number of wide hedgerow and woodland belts throughout the site that provide a valuable habitat for wildlife in particular bats. Development of the sites on Westerton Road will result in the amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the whole length of the Westerton Road. Site 1330B is an extension of the building that is currently ongoing adjacent to Jude's pond - and is for a further 32 houses ! This site has major highways access issues and has less than the recommended visibility splay for highways safety - further development of this site will exasperate current problems regarding drainage on the land - Haigh Moor Road residents already have to deal with flooding of the pavements and highways in the vicinity of Jude's pond.

Please note that all these sites are in addition to any planning applications that have already been approved.

464 houses in such a small vicinity is unsustainable, there are currently just over 300 pupils at Hill Top Primary School with no room for any expansion, the school is full and the same is true of Westerton which as you know was a small village school 20 years ago but is now one of the biggest primary schools in the Leeds district and all because of the amount of building that has taken place over recent years.

Leeds City Council have in their allocation plan confirmed that Ardsley and Robin Hood have a deficiency in parks and gardens (the only area in Leeds South West to be deficient) - our children already have very little designated play areas, they have also confirmed that we are deficient in outdoor sports areas and facilities for children to play. We have however got a surplus of natural green space which is currently under threat of housing - if this natural greenspace is to be used for any purpose, surely it should be used to reduce the deficit and improve our community. Further reduction of amenity greenspace in an area which is seeing more and more housing development is unfair and unsustainable.

Our GP surgeries are at breaking point with current waiting times for appointments being in excess of two weeks, the surgery at Leigh View was recently extended and it's difficult to envisage how this could be extended further to serve the population boom that will ensue if all these sites are developed.

Further erosion of the demarcation between West Ardsley & Tingley - soon the two settlements will merge into one and West Ardsley as a separate community will be subsumed into its near neighbour, the two areas will be barely distinguishable from each other which is contrary to the Councils policy SP1 which clearly states smaller Settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlement's size, function and sustainability. If these plans were approved it will no doubt

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373B

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Stephen Cowling

Representor No: PRS05177

result in urban sprawl with no identifiable boundaries.
Our fields provide a public amenity for dog-walkers, cyclists, ramblers and local residents alike and It would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This view was endorsed by the Secretary of State in their past decision letter.

Our road network was not built to support the existing volume of traffic , we do not have the infrastructure to support development of this scale, our public transport links are very poor with only one bus an hour into Leeds, the only viable means of transportation is by car which will have a cumulative impact on the A650 and A653 which are already congested
I trust that this is in order.

Regards

[x]

Name: Lisa Mulherin

Representor No: PRS05734

Representation ID: REP07126 Question Ref: H7

3373B Haigh Wood, West Ardsley - I support the Red designation of this site for the reasons set out in the consultation document. This wood is well used and much loved by the local community and walkers and cyclists from further afield and must be protected.

Name: Karen Williams

Representor No: PRS06027

Representation ID: REP06857 Question Ref: H7

Sites 3372 (Assumed as 3373 stated) & 3373 B - Red Agree with coding (Assumed)
I believe the areas in question are the only green areas left in the area for children to play, people to walk thier dogs etc, Tingley is already overcrowded with schools so much so that local children are having to travel to schools further away. this is the last of the green belt area left in tingley/ardsley. We already have too much traffic for such a built up area.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373B

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: West Ardsley Consortium

Representor No: PRS06168

Representation ID: REP06984 Question Ref: H7

Allocations Issues and Options Document- Sites 536 (Nook Farm) , 1330 B (Adjacent to Judes Pond), 1336 (Westerton Road, and 3373 A, Band C (Haigh Wood)

We act on behalf of the West Ardsley Consortium that has made formal comments to the Leeds Site Allocations Issues and Options documents. We enclose a copy of the Document submitted with the formal response for your information.

Our clients are interested in sites 536 (Nook Farm) , 1330 B (Adjacent to Judes Pond), 1336 (Westerton Road, and 3373 A, B and C (Haigh Wood) and have previously made representations for the sites to be allocated, along with a substantial area of ecologically maintained open space centred around the Haigh Wood area.

Having seen the draft proposals our clients are supportive in principle of the Councils approach to identifying a large portion of the land promoted by them for residential development. The areas identified as "Green" (for development) in the Issues and Options document at Haigh Wood amount to 16.83 Ha of land with a suggested dwelling capacity of over 400 units (at a reasonably low 25/Ha). The areas identified as "Red" (felt to be not suitable for development) amount to 17.5 Ha. This sets an approach of slightly over half the land being protected from development.

We note that the site known as Nook Farm (536) is an existing UDPR commitment and has no policy designation that has or would suggest anything other than its suitability for residential development. That site also has (contrary to the suggestion in the Issues and Options document) an extant planning permission. The details of this are set out in our formal representations.

I have reviewed the indicative boundaries suggested between the "Green" and "Red" sites in the Issues and Options document and undertaken a detailed assessment against trees, topography, the LNA of Haigh Wood and the stream running through it, whilst acknowledging the need for an uninterrupted green corridor separating the north west and south east areas of land, our clients are firmly of the view that the Councils preliminary work does not produce appropriate boundaries between development allocations and non development allocations. For example as figure 3 in the attached document shows land is identified by the Council for development in site 33 73A that includes part of the LNA, the trees of Haigh Wood and the stream running through it, whilst seeking to protect from development land to the south east which has none of those considerations applying to it.

Utilising the work already done on ecology, trees and hedges, landscape and topography, our Clients have carefully considered the Councils objectives and aspirations from the comments in the tables and pro Wilker Mon's L.L.P is a limited liability partnership which is registered in England and Wales with registration number OC338981 Registered office King's Court, 12 (King) Street, Leeds LS1 2HL Authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority. Any correspondence to "a partner" of Walker Morris LLP means a member of Walker Morris LLP VAT no OS481 802.2 50

H:\WP\11\InnQIRMSIRSCORRESI2U 07 I~ BIN 259-1 *Ms L Pickering\1.docx

Ms L Pickering

29 July 2013

Page 2

forms associated with the Issues and Options document. They have produced a revised masterplan and from that been able to identify appropriate development and allocation boundaries. These maintain a broad green corridor through the valley, protecting ecological interests, trees and the stream as well as views and the "open feel" of the valley itself. In particular this has not only widened the broad swathe of green between the development areas, compared to the earlier 2012 masterplan, but removed any road connections across the valley.

The resultant masterplan has been informed by all the Consortium team's professional disciplines and the changed highways connections fully evaluated to ensure they work appropriately.

The outcome is that of the area in the UDPR that is identified as N 11 (some 36.14 Ha) only 40% is now proposed for development. The suggested allocations (boundaries shown in red on Figure 6 of the attached document include (so that the allocations are not excessively subdivided) substantial green corridors and strategic planting, amounting to some 3.241ha. These run along the existing and proposed pedestrian and bridleway access corridors to the valley and the Wood. The suggested total area of the allocations (including the 3.24 Ha of undeveloped green space) is under half of the current N 11 land at 17.66 Ha. We believe this provides the right balance of development and protection of the wider site.

We note that the areas identified as "Green" in the Issues and Options document in this Outer South West area are insufficient by some margin (1,432) to meet the Core Strategy suggested proportion of housing for the area, even taking into account (and not questioning) the amount of development to come forward from permissions and existing allocations. There should be no doubt that all "Green" sites should therefore go forward for allocation. Indeed more will need to be found from "Amber" or even "Red" sites to provide sufficient land. In addition, there are proportionately far fewer "Green" sites (compared to "Amber") in East and West Ardsley than there are in Morley or the rest of the Outer South West.

The site at Haigh Wood with its non greenbelt status and accessibility and sustainability credentials provides a very good location for development and the provision of material environmental benefits through protection, increased access and environmental management of the Wood itself. As there have to be exceptional circumstances to take land out of the greenbelt, there must correspondingly be exceptional circumstances not to develop at Haigh Wood ahead of greenbelt land.

For all of these reasons our clients, look forward to working with the Council to bring forward development in line with the attached revised masterplan, which we believe fully addresses all comments made in the Issues and Options document and the related provisions about the land at Haigh Wood.

See PDF for master planning

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373B

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: West Ardsley Consortium

Representor No: PRS06168

Representation ID: REP07292 Question Ref: H7

Dear Madam

Allocations Issues and Options Document - Sites 536 (Nook Farm) , 1330 B (Adjacent to Judes Pond), 1336 (Westerton Road, and 3373 A, B and C (Haigh Wood)

We act on behalf of the West Ardsley Consortium that has made formal comments to the Leeds Site Allocations Issues and Options documents. We enclose a copy of the Document submitted with the formal response for your information.

Our clients are interested in sites 536 (Nook Farm) , 1330 B (Adjacent to Judes Pond), 1336 (Westerton Road, and 3373 A, B and C (Haigh Wood) and have previously made representations for the sites to be allocated, along with a substantial area of ecologically maintained open space centred around the Haigh Wood area.

Having seen the draft proposals our clients are supportive in principle of the Councils approach to identifying a large portion of the land promoted by them for residential development. The areas identified as "Green" (for development) in the Issues and Options document at Haigh Wood amount to 16.83 Ha of land with a suggested dwelling capacity of over 400 units (at a reasonably low 25/Ha). The areas identified as "Red" (felt to be not suitable for development) amount to 17.5 Ha. This sets an approach of slightly over half the land being protected from development.

We note that the site known as Nook Farm (536) is an existing UDPR commitment and has no policy designation that has or would suggest anything other than its suitability for residential development. That site also has (contrary to the suggestion in the Issues and Options document) an extant planning permission. The details of this are set out in our formal representations.

Having reviewed the indicative boundaries suggested between the "Green" and "Red" sites in the Issues and Options document and undertaken a detailed assessment against trees, topography, the LNA of Haigh Wood and the stream running through it, whilst acknowledging the need for an uninterrupted green corridor separating the north west and south east areas of land, our clients are firmly of the view that the Councils preliminary work does not produce appropriate boundaries between development allocations and non development allocations. For example as figure 3 in the attached document shows land is identified by the Council for development in site 3373A that includes part of the LNA, the trees of Haigh Wood and the stream running through it, whilst seeking to protect from development land to the south east which has none of those considerations applying to it.

Utilising the work already done on ecology, trees and hedges, landscape and topography, our Clients have carefully considered the Councils objectives and aspirations from the comments in the tables and pro formas associated with the Issues and Options document. They have produced a revised masterplan and from that been able to identify appropriate development and allocation boundaries. These maintain a broad green corridor through the valley, protecting ecological interests, trees and the stream as well as views and the "open feel" of the valley itself. In particular this has not only widened the broad swathe of green between the development areas, compared to the earlier 2012 masterplan, but removed any road connections across the valley.

The resultant masterplan has been informed by all the Consortium team's professional disciplines and the changed highways connections fully evaluated to ensure they work appropriately.

The outcome is that of the area in the UDPR that is identified as NI 1 (some 36.14 Ha) only 40% is now proposed for development. The suggested allocations (boundaries shown in red on Figure 6 of the attached document include (so that the allocations are not excessively subdivided) substantial green corridors and strategic planting, amounting to some 3.24Ha. These run along the existing and proposed pedestrian and bridleway access corridors to the valley and the Wood. The suggested total area of the allocations (including the 3.24 Ha of undeveloped green space) is under half of the current NI1 land at 17.66 Ha. We believe this provides the right balance of development and protection of the wider site.

We note that the areas identified as "Green" in the Issues and Options document in this Outer South West area are insufficient by some margin (1,432) to meet the Core Strategy suggested proportion of housing for the area, even taking into account (and not questioning) the amount of development to come forward from permissions and existing allocations. There should be no doubt that all "Green" sites should therefore go forward for allocation. Indeed more will need to be found from "Amber" or even "Red" sites to provide sufficient land. In addition, there are proportionately far fewer "Green" sites (compared to "Amber") in East and West Ardsley than there are in Morley or the rest of the Outer South West.

The site at Haigh Wood with its non greenbelt status and accessibility and sustainability credentials provides a very good location for development and the provision of material environmental benefits through protection, increased access and environmental management of the Wood itself. As there have to be exceptional circumstances to take land out of the greenbelt, there must correspondingly be exceptional circumstances not to develop at Haigh Wood ahead of greenbelt land.

For all of these reasons our clients, look forward to working with the Council to bring forward development in line with the attached revised masterplan, which we believe fully addresses all comments made in the Issues and Options document and the related proformas about the land at Haigh Wood.

Yours faithfully

[x]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373B

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Gillian, Paul, Sophie And George Carrigill

Representor No: PRS06230

Representation ID: REP07138 Question Ref: H7

No site ref given - assume sites 3373A, B, C

I would like to object to the land at the top of Hill top Lane West Ardsley being allocated for housing, My main concern is the junction coming out of Hill top Lane onto Batley road which already is a hazard, it is a T junction with houses directly facing the end of Hill Top Lane, and the residents park their cars directly in front of their properties. this makes the narrow road even narrower, cars coming up Haybeck lane have a blind corner and some come at terrific speed, there are children crossing at school times and I have witnessed many near misses. Speed cameras ,sleeping policemen and SLOW DOWN signs are needed already to prevent the inevitable happening. People Park on Hill Top Lane to drop children off at Hill Top School and Pick up ,on both sides of the road ,this causes access problems for residents.

The school is only 200 yards from the end of Hill Top Lane .Hill Top School is full to capacity, so unless the buildings are for elderly residents where would the children go to school? Our Local Doctors already have 17,000 patients and are not increasing the number of GP's, I know this as I work within the practice. Children play on Hill top lane on bikes and skate boards, and increased traffic would put a stop to that, it's quiet and safe at present, childrens freedom to play outside their homes in safety has to be considered.

The natural habitat enjoyed by birds, wildlife, walkers, dog walkers and children playing in Haigh Moor woods would be destroyed. The noise, dirt, and heavy plant traffic during development would have a massive affect on residents, especially the elderly who live in the bungalows on the left hand side. who ever has brain stormed this idea wants to come and spend an hour at the bottom of Hill Top lane one school morning and witness the chaos and danger there, we as residents are already inconvenienced greatly by the increased traffic since the School was built.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Michael Green

Representor No: PRS00053

Representation ID: REP00459 Question Ref: H2

Oppose in current form - the boundaries between these sites and 3373B seem to have been drawn arbitrarily as straight lines, without regard to the features on the ground. As long, thin, single ended sites, questions arise as to the acceptability of such large numbers of houses off a single spine road.

Name: Brian Guy

Representor No: PRS00142

Representation ID: REP04659 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Name: Sally Buttler

Representor No: PRS00162

Representation ID: REP01834 Question Ref: H1

3373C - Should be changed Green to Red. Will cause damage to Haigh Wood + other trees with preservation orders and will ruin valley. Potential land fill site + Quarry in the area of east sites.

Name: Katie Kerr

Representor No: PRS00163

Representation ID: REP01836 Question Ref: H1

3373c - No Colour change suggested. Traditional annual events eg Lee Fair disrupted. Already traffic/parking issues at peak times/school times. Increased housing means increased population increased traffic issues, school places? Reducing effectiveness of services available to public eg doctors. Plus access roads to new builds.

Name: Hayley Hey

Representor No: PRS00244

Representation ID: REP02178 Question Ref: H1

3373C - Traditional annual events eg lee fair disrupted. Again issues same as mentioned above [3373A, 1336] plus access roads to new builds.

Name: Terence Butler

Representor No: PRS00245

Representation ID: REP02179 Question Ref: H1

3373C - Green to red. Damage to Haigh Moor Wood and other trees.

Name: E Thornton

Representor No: PRS00309

Representation ID: REP02250 Question Ref: H1

Doctors already overstretched.

Name: Wenda P Whitehead

Representor No: PRS00312

Representation ID: REP04786 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Ann Williams

Representor No: PRS00407

Representation ID: REP02350 Question Ref: H1

3373A & 3373C Haigh Wood, West Ardsley - Green to Red

Damage to Haigh Wood and surrounding area - old historic site. Any more development would severely impact on this area in a detrimental way. This area needs protection not development due to flora and fauna of this area. Many bird species, bats, etc. A great number of people use this area for recreation and access to Haigh Moor Road and Batley Road. Access is required for Lee Fair, dating back to 1136 AD. (Surely no one can envisage the end of this oldest horse fair in the country).

The roads surrounding these sites are already clogged and there is a real danger of accidents to pedestrians due to the ongoing increase of traffic. My own address is almost inaccessible during term-time at Westerton School. Surrounding schools are already full and there is concern whether children reaching school age can even be accommodated in existing schools in the near future.

The whole community system would fail as Doctor's Surgeries, Dental Practices, etc are already turning people away because of the over population in this area.

We have a terrible public transport connection service and buses already have great trouble in negotiating Westerton and Skye roads at certain times of the day.

The suggested sites are well known undulating areas and this could prove difficult and costly to develop. There is also the mining and water wells to be considered.

Would the water supply be able to cope? The reservoir at Haigh Moor Road supplies this area.

If the trees (some of which are covered by a preservation order) are destroyed the area would lose all of its unique character and this would also impact on pollution levels.

Name: Janice Beever

Representor No: PRS00441

Representation ID: REP04791 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Name: John Williams

Representor No: PRS00475

Representation ID: REP02418 Question Ref: H1

3373A & 3373C Haigh Moor, Haigh Wood West Ardsley - Green to Red

We are already full!! Both public and private vehicles are clogging up on Westerton and Syke roads. Far more viable sites off Bradford Road or Thorpe Road.

Any further development would greatly and detrimentally impact on this historic and characterful area. Regards must be made to accommodate the oldest horse fair in the country (Lee Gap). The areas above provide well needed recreational space for walkers and cyclists and also access to Haigh Moor Road and Batley Road. Pollution would increase greatly if some of the natural habitat was disturbed as this is part of a site which is covered by a preservation order. There are numerous species of birds, plants, bats, and other creatures all native to this site.

Any development would impact on the scenery and views of residents in this area.

Our schools are at capacity already and any more vehicles in the area would give serious problems to the transport links and access to existing residential homes. We have limited shops in our area and not enough Doctor's surgeries or Dentists as it is! Where would all future children and adults go to school, doctors, dentists, etc.?

The site is very well documented as a mining area and consideration should be made to the water table in this area as there are wells and springs. Access would create major problems as the existing roads in our area were not designed for the existing amount of vehicles already trying to get from A to B.

I also have concerns regarding the pollution both from the lack of trees and the increase in traffic.

We have very poor public transport connections and a rise in buses would be totally unacceptable due to access at certain times.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Anne Smith

Representor No: PRS00911

Representation ID: REP04561 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood, West Ardsley. Change from Green to Red. Retain as agricultural land.

I refer to the consultation on the Leeds Local Plan and wish to object to the allocation of land in Tingley in the Outer South West document. My primary objection is to site 3373A, but the points raised are equally applicable to site 3373B, 1336 & 13308.

I appreciate the need for Leeds Council to provide for sufficient land to meet its housing requirements through the plan period. However, Para 151 of the NPPF requires that such allocations deliver sustainable development as this is the prime objective of the planning system that underpins the core principles of the planning system. I believe that these allocations fail to provide sustainable development for the following reasons, and so should be deleted from the plan:

Accessibility to Services

It is a core principle of the NPPF that development should be located where it has a good access to services to minimise the need for regular travel to those services by less sustainable methods. One of the core principles in Para 17 states that plan-making should 'actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable.'

The area around the allocations has a limited availability to services, with those that exists being local scale (corner food shops) or near to capacity (Westerton Primary school). All other services that are necessary for residential development are located beyond walking or cycling distance where access to them is only really achievable by car. This is not sustainable development.

The nearest existing supermarket to the allocations is at Morley which is over 2km from the site. The nearest neighbourhood centre allocated in the Outer South West plan is at Ardsley West which is also over 2km, but in the opposite direction so preventing any linked trips to these destinations. There is no community centre, sporting facilities, parks, cinema, etc.

When looking at access to employment opportunities the position is no better as the nearest concentrations of employment is over 1.5km distant, but is not safely accessible to the sites as it located across the M62 motorway. Indeed, the Outer South West plan identifies 14 sites within Ardsley and Robin Hood as having 'greatest potential for housing' and notes 7 other existing permissions/allocations, yet there is not a single existing or proposed employment site in the ward.

Surely this cannot be the coordinated development as is required to deliver the economic role of sustainable development that described in Para 7 of the NPPF, and so will also impact on the ability of the site's to demonstrate the social and environmental roles demanded by that Para.

Urban Form

The allocations will essentially close a gap that currently exists between the development around Westerton Road and that around Haigh Moor Road. These are distinct areas and the open land between them is a notable feature that is appreciated by the residents of both areas, and those traveling between them using either Baghill Road or Haigh Moor Road. These allocations will close that gap and so coalesce these settlements to the detriment of the identity of both. Development on the scale envisaged, particularly when combined with other development sites, does not "respect the character and objectives of local communities" (quote from paragraph 8.4 of Plan Overview.)

The retention of a narrow strip between these areas (allocation 3373B) will serve little benefit in preventing this coalescence as it is simply too narrow, and is in a natural dip where it will not be seen in views from the existing settlements. Instead these views will be taken up by the urban development on the two allocations which, due to their position on the slopes of the valley, will inevitably be the scene from all aspects in and around the area.

Wildlife Loss

Whilst the land is largely used and so managed for agriculture, and so of lesser wildlife importance, its margins and trees/hedgerows will be utilised by a range of species. It will also offer important foraging and commuting habitat for locally important species including foxes and bats and its development will therefore reduce their habitat. In turn this reduces the benefit of retaining site 3373B which I note your document explains is as it offers an attractive local resource for walkers and cyclists.

Agricultural Land

The land is designated as Grade 3 in the Natural England MAGIC website classification, albeit that this is based on a higher level and dated assessment. In the 28 years that I have overlooked the site it has always been farmed for crops, except in occasional fallow years. In reality I believe that this regular use for productive agriculture, the gentle sloping nature of the site to assist its drainage, and its south facing aspect will mean that the land of site 3373A is actually Grade 3a or even Grade 2. These grades are Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land that is protected from development by Para 112 of the NPPF.

The retention of such land is becoming increasingly critical due to the role that it plays toward delivering national food security and to reduce the distances travelled and so environmental impact of providing food. In addition, anaerobic digestion and other such energy production methods will become increasingly important in the future to national energy security. In turn this means that agricultural land will be required to provide fuel for these energy production methods. Areas of Best and Most Versatile agricultural land should be retained wherever possible as their higher quality ensures that they are better able to be flexibly farmed meet these needs.

Scale of Development

Throughout the NPPF it references the important role that communities have to play, with Para 1 stating that plans should 'reflect the needs and priorities of their communities'. The area around Westerton Road has seen extensive areas of residential development in the past 28 years, with that continuing with the development by Redraw Homes off Haigh Moor Road. There is clearly an argument that the area has accepted its fair share of development in recent years. The implications of further development in the area would be an increase in the population at a time when the services to support them are not available. InPhasing

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Anne Smith

Representor No: PRS00911

If it is decided that one or both of sites 3373A and 3373C are to be allocated then I request that they are phased for development in the later years of the plan. This would have twin benefits in allowing the recent growth in the area to be accommodated within the community and services to be established to support it, and would allow previously developed allocations and windfall sites to be developed first. Without that phasing the volume house builders in the market will inevitably take such greenfield sites forward as they are easier and so offer greater returns. This would not demonstrate the primacy of the plan-led system as required by Para 8.13.

Highway Capacity

An increase in housing in this area would only add to traffic problems along the A650 the A653 and other minor roads when there is an accident on the M62 when drivers try to find an alternative route.

Highway Safety

I note the intention to serve site 3373A by a single access point, being Upper Green Drive to Upper Green Avenue to meet Westerton Road opposite the primary school and then on via other routes to the main highway network. I cannot believe that a single access point is sufficient to service this number of properties, and cannot accept that the point at which it meets Westerton Road is appropriate.

Summary

I do not believe that the residential development of sites 3373A and 3373C would be sustainable development required by NPPF and so I ask that they be omitted from the Plan. If they are to be retained I request that they be phased to prevent development for a period of say 15 years to allow the community to become settled from recent growth, new services and employment opportunities to be developed and to allow the development of sequentially preferable brownfield sites elsewhere in the city.

I trust that these comments assist your consideration of the future housing allocations in this area. Please add my details to your consultation list so that I can be advised of any future consultation exercises of this nature.

Representation ID: REP04561 Question Ref: H11

Phasing

If it is decided that one or both of sites 3373A and 3373C are to be allocated then I request that they are phased for development in the later years of the plan. This would have twin benefits in allowing the recent growth in the area to be accommodated within the community and services to be established to support it, and would allow previously developed allocations and windfall sites to be developed first. Without that phasing the volume house builders in the market will inevitably take such greenfield sites forward as they are easier and so offer greater returns. This would not demonstrate the primacy of the plan-led system as required by Para 8.13.

Highway Capacity

An increase in housing in this area would only add to traffic problems along the A650 the A653 and other minor roads when there is an accident on the M62 when drivers try to find an alternative route.

Highway Safety

I note the intention to serve site 3373A by a single access point, being Upper Green Drive to Upper Green Avenue to meet Westerton Road opposite the primary school and then on via other routes to the main highway network. I cannot believe that a single access point is sufficient to service this number of properties, and cannot accept that the point at which it meets Westerton Road is appropriate.

Summary

I do not believe that the residential development of sites 3373A and 3373C would be sustainable development required by NPPF and so I ask that they be omitted from the Plan. If they are to be retained I request that they be phased to prevent development for a period of say 15 years to allow the community to become settled from recent growth, new services and employment opportunities to be developed and to allow the development of sequentially preferable brownfield sites elsewhere in the city.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: P S Barrie

Representor No: PRS00915

Representation ID: REP04810 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Representation ID: REP04769 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Representation ID: REP04781 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Representation ID: REP02944 Question Ref: H1

3373c Off Haigh Moor Road - Green to Red

Next to site of Haigh Wood - would mar an existing area of natural interest.

Access would be via Haigh Moor Road . Congestion here with other proposed sites would be catastrophic for the residents of this area . Traffic would be too dense for the road network to handle.

Schools and doctors full up in this area.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Jake Weatherhead

Representor No: PRS00948

Representation ID: REP02976 Question Ref: H1

3373a Upper Green, Tingley/3373c Upper Green Tingley/1336 Upper Green Tingley - Green to Red
SITE ALLOCATION CHANGES —SITE NUMBERS 3373A / 3373C / 1336

We are completely against the development of the above sites for a number of reasons, both personal and in the overall interest of the people living within Greater Morley.

- Access —Suggested access to the new sites through current 'Upper Green' roads would not be viable as road width/layout does not comply with planning requirements for a throughroad.

At present certain areas of the roads cannot accommodate two cars at the same time, more houses mean more traffic. This could lead to huge health and safety issues for motorists and pedestrians alike. Currently traffic on these roads are already at a high especially at peak times and the start and end of the school day (Westerton Primary is directly opposite upper green and is extremely busy at drop off and pick up times).

- Local framework —The local schools (both primary and secondary) are already full and have waiting lists for children already living in the area. Primary schools such as Westerton (already considered a large primary with 100 children per year group) is full with a considerable waiting list, Blackgates Primary has already been expanded to cope with the demand and has no further scope to expand even more. Secondary schools such as Woodkirk and Morley Academy are full with waiting lists. Leeds City Council are aware that there are not enough secondary school places available in this area for children already in the state school system and have granted authority to build a free school in Leeds City Centre(to open 01/09/14). With this in mind perhaps redevelopment of areas surrounding the City Centre or areas within the City Centre should be considered.

- Local Doctors surgeries are already full and continue to take on new patients.

Appointments are non-existent with most people having to go to drop in clinics to sit and wait (sometimes for up to 2 hours). This is hugely problematic for vulnerable patients (small children and the elderly) that sometimes require immediate attention. As for registering with a local NHS dentist— it's virtually impossible!

- Impact on environment. Planning permission stated that when our house was built (2008) the builders had to maintain the few trees between adjoining properties because of impact on the local environment and also to provide screening. Yet the same council with their new plans are happy to see the destruction of acres of protected trees and shrubs (Haigh Woods). This would have a huge impact on wildlife where we have a thriving bird population (which is currently in decline nationally) and a number of protected bats in the area. These birds and bats live/breed and feed in the zones currently highlighted for development. Tingley's green fields are already in decline, brownfield sites should be considered for redevelopment before we destroy our environment further. Planning permission for 20,000 houses have already been granted within the Leeds Area that haven't been built yet, surely these houses should be built and derelict areas redeveloped before we consider destroying green fields and wooded areas.

- The value of current properties will be greatly affected by the addition of housing on the sites stated. Currently Upper Green Drive is one of the most expensive streets for house prices in WF3, houses are built to a high standard and of similar size/value. When we purchased our house in 2008 we paid a premium rate which took into account not only the quality of the house but the area in which the house was situated (idyllic views of green fields and woods). The planned development would have a huge impact on property value and with most houses on the street having been newly built or recently purchased (valued according to the location/setting) there is a major concern that many families would face the possibility of negative equity. The current economic climate is already taking its toll on many families; this would further financially impact them.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Amy Weatherhead

Representor No: PRS00951

Representation ID: REP02990 Question Ref: H1

3373a Upper Green, Tingley/3373c Upper Green Tingley/1336 Upper Green Tingley - Green to Red
SITE ALLOCATION CHANGES —SITE NUMBERS 3373A / 3373C / 1336

We are completely against the development of the above sites for a number of reasons, both personal and in the overall interest of the people living within Greater Morley.

- Access —Suggested access to the new sites through current 'Upper Green' roads would not be viable as road width/layout does not comply with planning requirements for a throughroad.

At present certain areas of the roads cannot accommodate two cars at the same time, more houses mean more traffic. This could lead to huge health and safety issues for motorists and pedestrians alike. Currently traffic on these roads are already at a high especially at peak times and the start and end of the school day (Westerton Primary is directly opposite upper green and is extremely busy at drop off and pick up times).

- Local framework —The local schools (both primary and secondary) are already full and have waiting lists for children already living in the area. Primary schools such as Westerton (already considered a large primary with 100 children per year group) is full with a considerable waiting list, Blackgates Primary has already been expanded to cope with the demand and has no further scope to expand even more. Secondary schools such as Woodkirk and Morley Academy are full with waiting lists. Leeds City Council are aware that there are not enough secondary school places available in this area for children already in the state school system and have granted authority to build a free school in Leeds City Centre (to open 01/09/14). With this in mind perhaps redevelopment of areas surrounding the City Centre or areas within the City Centre should be considered.

- Local Doctors surgeries are already full and continue to take on new patients.

Appointments are non-existent with most people having to go to drop in clinics to sit and wait (sometimes for up to 2 hours). This is hugely problematic for vulnerable patients (small children and the elderly) that sometimes require immediate attention. As for registering with a local NHS dentist— it's virtually impossible!

- Impact on environment. Planning permission stated that when our house was built (2008) the builders had to maintain the few trees between adjoining properties because of impact on the local environment and also to provide screening. Yet the same council with their new plans are happy to see the destruction of acres of protected trees and shrubs (Haigh Woods). This would have a huge impact on wildlife where we have a thriving bird population (which is currently in decline nationally) and a number of protected bats in the area. These birds and bats live/breed and feed in the zones currently highlighted for development. Tingley's green fields are already in decline, brownfield sites should be considered for redevelopment before we destroy our environment further. Planning permission for 20,000 houses have already been granted within the Leeds Area that haven't been built yet, surely these houses should be built and derelict areas redeveloped before we consider destroying green fields and wooded areas.

- The value of current properties will be greatly affected by the addition of housing on the sites stated. Currently Upper Green Drive is one of the most expensive streets for house prices in WF3, houses are built to a high standard and of similar size/value. When we purchased our house in 2008 we paid a premium rate which took into account not only the quality of the house but the area in which the house was situated (idyllic views of green fields and woods). The planned development would have a huge impact on property value and with most houses on the street having been newly built or recently purchased (valued according to the location/setting) there is a major concern that many families would face the possibility of negative equity. The current economic climate is already taking its toll on many families; this would further financially impact them.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Andrew Weatherhead

Representor No: PRS00954

Representation ID: REP02993 Question Ref: H1

3373a Upper Green, Tingley/3373c Upper Green Tingley/1336 Upper Green Tingley - Green to Red
SITE ALLOCATION CHANGES —SITE NUMBERS 3373A / 3373C / 1336

We are completely against the development of the above sites for a number of reasons, both personal and in the overall interest of the people living within Greater Morley.

- Access —Suggested access to the new sites through current 'Upper Green' roads would not be viable as road width/layout does not comply with planning requirements for a throughroad.

At present certain areas of the roads cannot accommodate two cars at the same time, more houses mean more traffic. This could lead to huge health and safety issues for motorists and pedestrians alike. Currently traffic on these roads are already at a high especially at peak times and the start and end of the school day (Westerton Primary is directly opposite upper green and is extremely busy at drop off and pick up times).

- Local framework —The local schools (both primary and secondary) are already full and have waiting lists for children already living in the area. Primary schools such as Westerton (already considered a large primary with 100 children per year group) is full with a considerable waiting list, Blackgates Primary has already been expanded to cope with the demand and has no further scope to expand even more. Secondary schools such as Woodkirk and Morley Academy are full with waiting lists. Leeds City Council are aware that there are not enough secondary school places available in this area for children already in the state school system and have granted authority to build a free school in Leeds City Centre(to open 01/09/14). With this in mind perhaps redevelopment of areas surrounding the City Centre or areas within the City Centre should be considered.

- Local Doctors surgeries are already full and continue to take on new patients.

Appointments are non-existent with most people having to go to drop in clinics to sit and wait (sometimes for up to 2 hours). This is hugely problematic for vulnerable patients (small children and the elderly) that sometimes require immediate attention. As for registering with a local NHS dentist— it's virtually impossible!

- Impact on environment. Planning permission stated that when our house was built (2008) the builders had to maintain the few trees between adjoining properties because of impact on the local environment and also to provide screening. Yet the same council with their new plans are happy to see the destruction of acres of protected trees and shrubs (Haigh Woods). This would have a huge impact on wildlife where we have a thriving bird population (which is currently in decline nationally) and a number of protected bats in the area. These birds and bats live/breed and feed in the zones currently highlighted for development. Tingley's green fields are already in decline, brownfield sites should be considered for redevelopment before we destroy our environment further. Planning permission for 20,000 houses have already been granted within the Leeds Area that haven't been built yet, surely these houses should be built and derelict areas redeveloped before we consider destroying green fields and wooded areas.

- The value of current properties will be greatly affected by the addition of housing on the sites stated. Currently Upper Green Drive is one of the most expensive streets for house prices in WF3, houses are built to a high standard and of similar size/value. When we purchased our house in 2008 we paid a premium rate which took into account not only the quality of the house but the area in which the house was situated (idyllic views of green fields and woods). The planned development would have a huge impact on property value and with most houses on the street having been newly built or recently purchased (valued according to the location/setting) there is a major concern that many families would face the possibility of negative equity. The current economic climate is already taking its toll on many families; this would further financially impact them.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Kim Weatherhead

Representor No: PRS00956

Representation ID: REP02995 Question Ref: H1

3373a Upper Green, Tingley/3373c Upper Green Tingley/1336 Upper Green Tingley - Green to Red
SITE ALLOCATION CHANGES —SITE NUMBERS 3373A / 3373C / 1336

We are completely against the development of the above sites for a number of reasons, both personal and in the overall interest of the people living within Greater Morley.

- Access —Suggested access to the new sites through current 'Upper Green' roads would not be viable as road width/layout does not comply with planning requirements for a throughroad.

At present certain areas of the roads cannot accommodate two cars at the same time, more houses mean more traffic. This could lead to huge health and safety issues for motorists and pedestrians alike. Currently traffic on these roads are already at a high especially at peak times and the start and end of the school day (Westerton Primary is directly opposite upper green and is extremely busy at drop off and pick up times).

- Local framework —The local schools (both primary and secondary) are already full and have waiting lists for children already living in the area. Primary schools such as Westerton (already considered a large primary with 100 children per year group) is full with a considerable waiting list, Blackgates Primary has already been expanded to cope with the demand and has no further scope to expand even more. Secondary schools such as Woodkirk and Morley Academy are full with waiting lists. Leeds City Council are aware that there are not enough secondary school places available in this area for children already in the state school system and have granted authority to build a free school in Leeds City Centre(to open 01/09/14). With this in mind perhaps redevelopment of areas surrounding the City Centre or areas within the City Centre should be considered.

- Local Doctors surgeries are already full and continue to take on new patients.

Appointments are non-existent with most people having to go to drop in clinics to sit and wait (sometimes for up to 2 hours). This is hugely problematic for vulnerable patients (small children and the elderly) that sometimes require immediate attention. As for registering with a local NHS dentist— it's virtually impossible!

- Impact on environment. Planning permission stated that when our house was built (2008) the builders had to maintain the few trees between adjoining properties because of impact on the local environment and also to provide screening. Yet the same council with their new plans are happy to see the destruction of acres of protected trees and shrubs (Haigh Woods). This would have a huge impact on wildlife where we have a thriving bird population (which is currently in decline nationally) and a number of protected bats in the area. These birds and bats live/breed and feed in the zones currently highlighted for development. Tingley's green fields are already in decline, brownfield sites should be considered for redevelopment before we destroy our environment further. Planning permission for 20,000 houses have already been granted within the Leeds Area that haven't been built yet, surely these houses should be built and derelict areas redeveloped before we consider destroying green fields and wooded areas.

- The value of current properties will be greatly affected by the addition of housing on the sites stated. Currently Upper Green Drive is one of the most expensive streets for house prices in WF3, houses are built to a high standard and of similar size/value. When we purchased our house in 2008 we paid a premium rate which took into account not only the quality of the house but the area in which the house was situated (idyllic views of green fields and woods). The planned development would have a huge impact on property value and with most houses on the street having been newly built or recently purchased (valued according to the location/setting) there is a major concern that many families would face the possibility of negative equity. The current economic climate is already taking its toll on many families; this would further financially impact them.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: M Bunney

Representor No: PRS00957

Representation ID: REP02997 Question Ref: H1

3373a Upper Green, Tingley/3373c Upper Green Tingley/1336 Upper Green Tingley - Green to Red
SITE ALLOCATION CHANGES —SITE NUMBERS 3373A / 3373C / 1336

We are completely against the development of the above sites for a number of reasons, both personal and in the overall interest of the people living within Greater Morley.

- Access —Suggested access to the new sites through current 'Upper Green' roads would not be viable as road width/layout does not comply with planning requirements for a throughroad.

At present certain areas of the roads cannot accommodate two cars at the same time, more houses mean more traffic. This could lead to huge health and safety issues for motorists and pedestrians alike. Currently traffic on these roads are already at a high especially at peak times and the start and end of the school day (Westerton Primary is directly opposite upper green and is extremely busy at drop off and pick up times).

- Local framework —The local schools (both primary and secondary) are already full and have waiting lists for children already living in the area. Primary schools such as Westerton (already considered a large primary with 100 children per year group) is full with a considerable waiting list, Blackgates Primary has already been expanded to cope with the demand and has no further scope to expand even more. Secondary schools such as Woodkirk and Morley Academy are full with waiting lists. Leeds City Council are aware that there are not enough secondary school places available in this area for children already in the state school system and have granted authority to build a free school in Leeds City Centre(to open 01/09/14). With this in mind perhaps redevelopment of areas surrounding the City Centre or areas within the City Centre should be considered.

- Local Doctors surgeries are already full and continue to take on new patients.

Appointments are non-existent with most people having to go to drop in clinics to sit and wait (sometimes for up to 2 hours). This is hugely problematic for vulnerable patients (small children and the elderly) that sometimes require immediate attention. As for registering with a local NHS dentist— it's virtually impossible!

- Impact on environment. Planning permission stated that when our house was built (2008) the builders had to maintain the few trees between adjoining properties because of impact on the local environment and also to provide screening. Yet the same council with their new plans are happy to see the destruction of acres of protected trees and shrubs (Haigh Woods). This would have a huge impact on wildlife where we have a thriving bird population (which is currently in decline nationally) and a number of protected bats in the area. These birds and bats live/breed and feed in the zones currently highlighted for development. Tingley's green fields are already in decline, brownfield sites should be considered for redevelopment before we destroy our environment further. Planning permission for 20,000 houses have already been granted within the Leeds Area that haven't been built yet, surely these houses should be built and derelict areas redeveloped before we consider destroying green fields and wooded areas.

- The value of current properties will be greatly affected by the addition of housing on the sites stated. Currently Upper Green Drive is one of the most expensive streets for house prices in WF3, houses are built to a high standard and of similar size/value. When we purchased our house in 2008 we paid a premium rate which took into account not only the quality of the house but the area in which the house was situated (idyllic views of green fields and woods). The planned development would have a huge impact on property value and with most houses on the street having been newly built or recently purchased (valued according to the location/setting) there is a major concern that many families would face the possibility of negative equity. The current economic climate is already taking its toll on many families; this would further financially impact them.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Daniel Newsome

Representor No: PRS00958

Representation ID: REP02999 Question Ref: H1

3373a Upper Green, Tingley/3373c Upper Green Tingley/1336 Upper Green Tingley - Green to Red
SITE ALLOCATION CHANGES —SITE NUMBERS 3373A / 3373C / 1336

We are completely against the development of the above sites for a number of reasons, both personal and in the overall interest of the people living within Greater Morley.

- Access —Suggested access to the new sites through current 'Upper Green' roads would not be viable as road width/layout does not comply with planning requirements for a throughroad.

At present certain areas of the roads cannot accommodate two cars at the same time, more houses mean more traffic. This could lead to huge health and safety issues for motorists and pedestrians alike. Currently traffic on these roads are already at a high especially at peak times and the start and end of the school day (Westerton Primary is directly opposite upper green and is extremely busy at drop off and pick up times).

- Local framework —The local schools (both primary and secondary) are already full and have waiting lists for children already living in the area. Primary schools such as Westerton (already considered a large primary with 100 children per year group) is full with a considerable waiting list, Blackgates Primary has already been expanded to cope with the demand and has no further scope to expand even more. Secondary schools such as Woodkirk and Morley Academy are full with waiting lists. Leeds City Council are aware that there are not enough secondary school places available in this area for children already in the state school system and have granted authority to build a free school in Leeds City Centre(to open 01/09/14). With this in mind perhaps redevelopment of areas surrounding the City Centre or areas within the City Centre should be considered.

- Local Doctors surgeries are already full and continue to take on new patients.

Appointments are non-existent with most people having to go to drop in clinics to sit and wait (sometimes for up to 2 hours). This is hugely problematic for vulnerable patients (small children and the elderly) that sometimes require immediate attention. As for registering with a local NHS dentist— it's virtually impossible!

- Impact on environment. Planning permission stated that when our house was built (2008) the builders had to maintain the few trees between adjoining properties because of impact on the local environment and also to provide screening. Yet the same council with their new plans are happy to see the destruction of acres of protected trees and shrubs (Haigh Woods). This would have a huge impact on wildlife where we have a thriving bird population (which is currently in decline nationally) and a number of protected bats in the area. These birds and bats live/breed and feed in the zones currently highlighted for development. Tingley's green fields are already in decline, brownfield sites should be considered for redevelopment before we destroy our environment further. Planning permission for 20,000 houses have already been granted within the Leeds Area that haven't been built yet, surely these houses should be built and derelict areas redeveloped before we consider destroying green fields and wooded areas.

- The value of current properties will be greatly affected by the addition of housing on the sites stated. Currently Upper Green Drive is one of the most expensive streets for house prices in WF3, houses are built to a high standard and of similar size/value. When we purchased our house in 2008 we paid a premium rate which took into account not only the quality of the house but the area in which the house was situated (idyllic views of green fields and woods). The planned development would have a huge impact on property value and with most houses on the street having been newly built or recently purchased (valued according to the location/setting) there is a major concern that many families would face the possibility of negative equity. The current economic climate is already taking its toll on many families; this would further financially impact them.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Tom Newsome

Representor No: PRS00960

Representation ID: REP03000 Question Ref: H1

3373a Upper Green, Tingley/3373c Upper Green Tingley/1336 Upper Green Tingley - Green to Red
SITE ALLOCATION CHANGES —SITE NUMBERS 3373A / 3373C / 1336

We are completely against the development of the above sites for a number of reasons, both personal and in the overall interest of the people living within Greater Morley.

- Access —Suggested access to the new sites through current 'Upper Green' roads would not be viable as road width/layout does not comply with planning requirements for a throughroad.

At present certain areas of the roads cannot accommodate two cars at the same time, more houses mean more traffic. This could lead to huge health and safety issues for motorists and pedestrians alike. Currently traffic on these roads are already at a high especially at peak times and the start and end of the school day (Westerton Primary is directly opposite upper green and is extremely busy at drop off and pick up times).

- Local framework —The local schools (both primary and secondary) are already full and have waiting lists for children already living in the area. Primary schools such as Westerton (already considered a large primary with 100 children per year group) is full with a considerable waiting list, Blackgates Primary has already been expanded to cope with the demand and has no further scope to expand even more. Secondary schools such as Woodkirk and Morley Academy are full with waiting lists. Leeds City Council are aware that there are not enough secondary school places available in this area for children already in the state school system and have granted authority to build a free school in Leeds City Centre(to open 01/09/14). With this in mind perhaps redevelopment of areas surrounding the City Centre or areas within the City Centre should be considered.

- Local Doctors surgeries are already full and continue to take on new patients.

Appointments are non-existent with most people having to go to drop in clinics to sit and wait (sometimes for up to 2 hours). This is hugely problematic for vulnerable patients (small children and the elderly) that sometimes require immediate attention. As for registering with a local NHS dentist— it's virtually impossible!

- Impact on environment. Planning permission stated that when our house was built (2008) the builders had to maintain the few trees between adjoining properties because of impact on the local environment and also to provide screening. Yet the same council with their new plans are happy to see the destruction of acres of protected trees and shrubs (Haigh Woods). This would have a huge impact on wildlife where we have a thriving bird population (which is currently in decline nationally) and a number of protected bats in the area. These birds and bats live/breed and feed in the zones currently highlighted for development. Tingley's green fields are already in decline, brownfield sites should be considered for redevelopment before we destroy our environment further. Planning permission for 20,000 houses have already been granted within the Leeds Area that haven't been built yet, surely these houses should be built and derelict areas redeveloped before we consider destroying green fields and wooded areas.

- The value of current properties will be greatly affected by the addition of housing on the sites stated. Currently Upper Green Drive is one of the most expensive streets for house prices in WF3, houses are built to a high standard and of similar size/value. When we purchased our house in 2008 we paid a premium rate which took into account not only the quality of the house but the area in which the house was situated (idyllic views of green fields and woods). The planned development would have a huge impact on property value and with most houses on the street having been newly built or recently purchased (valued according to the location/setting) there is a major concern that many families would face the possibility of negative equity. The current economic climate is already taking its toll on many families; this would further financially impact them.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: J Newsome

Representor No: PRS00961

Representation ID: REP03002 Question Ref: H1

3373a Upper Green, Tingley/3373c Upper Green Tingley/1336 Upper Green Tingley - Green to Red
SITE ALLOCATION CHANGES —SITE NUMBERS 3373A / 3373C / 1336

We are completely against the development of the above sites for a number of reasons, both personal and in the overall interest of the people living within Greater Morley.

- Access —Suggested access to the new sites through current 'Upper Green' roads would not be viable as road width/layout does not comply with planning requirements for a throughroad.

At present certain areas of the roads cannot accommodate two cars at the same time, more houses mean more traffic. This could lead to huge health and safety issues for motorists and pedestrians alike. Currently traffic on these roads are already at a high especially at peak times and the start and end of the school day (Westerton Primary is directly opposite upper green and is extremely busy at drop off and pick up times).

- Local framework —The local schools (both primary and secondary) are already full and have waiting lists for children already living in the area. Primary schools such as Westerton (already considered a large primary with 100 children per year group) is full with a considerable waiting list, Blackgates Primary has already been expanded to cope with the demand and has no further scope to expand even more. Secondary schools such as Woodkirk and Morley Academy are full with waiting lists. Leeds City Council are aware that there are not enough secondary school places available in this area for children already in the state school system and have granted authority to build a free school in Leeds City Centre(to open 01/09/14). With this in mind perhaps redevelopment of areas surrounding the City Centre or areas within the City Centre should be considered.

- Local Doctors surgeries are already full and continue to take on new patients.

Appointments are non-existent with most people having to go to drop in clinics to sit and wait (sometimes for up to 2 hours). This is hugely problematic for vulnerable patients (small children and the elderly) that sometimes require immediate attention. As for registering with a local NHS dentist— it's virtually impossible!

- Impact on environment. Planning permission stated that when our house was built (2008) the builders had to maintain the few trees between adjoining properties because of impact on the local environment and also to provide screening. Yet the same council with their new plans are happy to see the destruction of acres of protected trees and shrubs (Haigh Woods). This would have a huge impact on wildlife where we have a thriving bird population (which is currently in decline nationally) and a number of protected bats in the area. These birds and bats live/breed and feed in the zones currently highlighted for development. Tingley's green fields are already in decline, brownfield sites should be considered for redevelopment before we destroy our environment further. Planning permission for 20,000 houses have already been granted within the Leeds Area that haven't been built yet, surely these houses should be built and derelict areas redeveloped before we consider destroying green fields and wooded areas.

- The value of current properties will be greatly affected by the addition of housing on the sites stated. Currently Upper Green Drive is one of the most expensive streets for house prices in WF3, houses are built to a high standard and of similar size/value. When we purchased our house in 2008 we paid a premium rate which took into account not only the quality of the house but the area in which the house was situated (idyllic views of green fields and woods). The planned development would have a huge impact on property value and with most houses on the street having been newly built or recently purchased (valued according to the location/setting) there is a major concern that many families would face the possibility of negative equity. The current economic climate is already taking its toll on many families; this would further financially impact them.

Name: Amy Weldon

Representor No: PRS00980

Representation ID: REP03023 Question Ref: H1

1336 (Assumed 3373A & 3373C) Haigh Wood - Green to Red
Woodland site
Wildlife loss, biodiversity

Name: S Milner

Representor No: PRS01004

Representation ID: REP03053 Question Ref: H1

3373c, Tingley - Red
Not enough schools or local amenities to support this site

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: M Mccleave

Representor No: PRS01126

Representation ID: REP03201 Question Ref: H1

3373A & C - Green to Red

The site would cause pressure on the schools. The access roads are impassable at school times.

Not enough doctors, dentists, schools to accommodate.

Name: Michael Stilwell

Representor No: PRS01133

Representation ID: REP03207 Question Ref: H1

3373C

Lack of amenities – the amenities in the area cannot support the existing population of West Ardsley, never mind accepting an influx of possibly 5000 more.

- Virtually all the shops have closed over the years, there are now only 3 grocery shops in the area. Anyone living at the southern end of Haigh Moor Road has over 1 mile to travel to the nearest shop.

- The schools are overcrowded, Westerton Road has had more external classrooms added, so it cannot be extended. Hill Top School is nearly full now from the existing population growth, again it is extremely limited in expansion possibilities.

- Bus services are pathetic, services to Leeds, Dewsbury and Wakefield are hourly at best. Batley is only accessible from Wakefield –Batley Road. There are areas where buses have been removed completely. This week another service has been stopped.

- There are not any play areas for children, your own survey records this failing.

- There is only one medical centre with 8 doctors giving cover to some existing 15000 patients. To get an appointment with a specific GP can take 3 weeks, the centre has recently been extended to its limits so there is nowhere to go. Also there is only one pharmacist.

Traffic

All the roads in the area are in a bad state of repair, I have lived here for 28 years and Haigh Moor Road has never been resurfaced despite 3 new housing estates accessing it. In June 1992 the planning inspector denied a planning application (91/23/00350) for an annex for an invalid because although neither he nor his brother drove. The reason for this was "I am concerned that were an additional dwelling to be provided there would be no guarantee that it would not lead to additional traffic generation at some future time, perhaps through changed circumstances, with consequent adverse impact on highway safety." Yet here we are with a further 70 houses at Foxfields and Jude's Pond and a proposed 179 on these new sites, probably adding in excess of 500 vehicles to Haigh Moor Road.

There has been a water leak on HMR which despite being reported to Yorkshire Water is still flowing after 3 months and has now become 2 leaks. The western end of Westerton Road is in a dangerous state with potholes and speed restriction bumps. LCC appears to be unable to keep up with the maintenance of its roads in South Leeds.

LCC's attitude to this area seems to be that Ardsley is an outpost on the borders with Wakefield and Kirklees and beyond the borough or Morley, so we can be conveniently ignored. Ardsley is quite definitely being asked to provide the lion's share of new housing without any benefit, it has poor services and has become a dormitory area of Leeds.

Name: Lynne Paul

Representor No: PRS01169

Representation ID: REP04800 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Name: D Paul

Representor No: PRS01183

Representation ID: REP04793 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Rita Sykes

Representor No: PRS01432

Representation ID: REP03560 Question Ref: H1

3373C -Where are the proposed access roads to this site? Hill Top Lane is totally inadequate to take traffic for an additional 144 properties. The junction with Batley Road is barely adequate for the existing properties (road widths/site lines ect) and would be unsuitable to receive extra traffic. What are the proposals to provide additional amenities such as school places, local health/doctors services and shops to cope with the extra homes.

Name: James Pow

Representor No: PRS01505

Representation ID: REP03644 Question Ref: H1

3373C Upper Green Tingley GREEN TO RED

Name: B Stringer

Representor No: PRS01606

Representation ID: REP04797 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Name: L.e Beever

Representor No: PRS01607

Representation ID: REP04804 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Tim Chapman

Representor No: PRS01644

Representation ID: REP03799 Question Ref: H1

3373C -

I am making my response by letter; the online boxes rejected my comments because they exceed 3,000 digits.

3373A Haigh Wood, West Ardsley, 3373C Haigh Wood, West Ardsley, 1336 Westerton Road, West Ardsley, 3456A Ardsley Reservoir, 1258 Westerton Road, Tingley, 3365 Westerton Road, Tingley, 1032 Bradford Road, 1143B & 1143D Thorpe Lane, Tingley.

Objections.

The Core Strategy seeks to be "fair". The word is used in paragraph 1.2 and again in 1.14. Yet the proposed green housing sites when taken together would definitely not be fair to West Ardsley and Tingley. No justification has been given as to why there is such a concentration here, nor any evidence of local need. Indeed, paragraph 4.6.14 states that "The SHMA 2011 was not able to identify any geographically specific need for new housing based on population growth." The 13 green housing sites in Ardsley and Tingley seem to have been assessed individually rather than their cumulative impact. This impact is potentially very much greater when considered alongside Kirklees Council's proposals for the Chidswell area, and comes on top of the huge impact on West Ardsley of major housing development in the 1990s - the estates now accessed by Lowry Road and Constable Road. The newly proposed sites taken together would consolidate semi-rural groups of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area. Most of the open frontages to Bradford Road and Westerton Road would be built on, removing open aspects and distant views and tending towards the creation of amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the length of the A650.

Site 3373C. Additional objections

1. Development of this site would be contrary to the following sections of the Council's policy SP1 in the Core Strategy:

SP1 (i) states: "Smaller Settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlement's size, function and sustainability."

Site 3373C, with its estimated capacity of 144 dwellings, does not have regard to the size, function and sustainability of West Ardsley.

SP1 (iii) states: "For development to respect and enhance the local character and identity of places and neighbourhoods". The local character and identity of West Ardsley would be seriously threatened by 3373C, especially when combined with sites 3373A, 536, 3456A and 1336, and would make its component areas of Upper Green, Haigh Moor and Hill Top barely distinguishable from each other.

Three letters from the Planning Inspectorate were used in the Council's own evidence to the Unitary Development Plan public inquiry in 1995. In paragraph 39 of his report on the Morley Local Plan, the inspector considered that the planned development at Haigh Wood (site WA2H) would have a "very serious impact upon the character and environment of West Ardsley". He concluded in paragraph 10: "In the past, development in the Morley area would appear to have been sporadic and opportunist, placing the identity of the smaller settlements at risk and tending towards the creation of amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the length of the A650 Bradford to Wakefield road. In my view, the further diffusion of the existing loosely-knit settlement pattern should, as far as possible, be resisted."

Considering appeals in 1986 on 81/23/00212 and 81/23/00213 (broadly the same area as LDF sites 3373A/B/C and 1336) the inspector said "It would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This was endorsed in the Secretary of State's decision letter.

In 1994, a third inspector dismissed an appeal to develop land at Arthington Close near the the edge of Haigh Wood because it would "unacceptably erode the fringe of this rural area and would lead to pressure for further encroachment of residential development, most particularly in the fields to the west...". Although some years have passed since these decisions, the character and environment of the area are still semi-rural and just as delicate. When cogent arguments have been repeatedly made against development of the 3373 areas by the Secretary of State, by three planning inspectors and by Leeds Council itself (in evidence to the UDP inquiry), there can be no justification for sites 3373A, 3373C and 1336 being pursued for residential development in the LDF. They should instead be reclassified as "red" and withdrawn from consideration for development when producing the next stage of the plan.

2. Schools. Primary and secondary schools already full and difficult to expand further.

3. Agricultural land. Good quality agricultural land would be lost.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Tim Chapman

Representor No: PRS01644

Representation ID: REP05648 Question Ref: H1

Local Development Framework, Site Allocations Plan, Public Consultation.

I am making my response by letter; the online boxes rejected my comments because they exceed 3,000 digits.

3373A Haigh Wood, West Ardsley, 3373C Haigh Wood, West Ardsley,
1336 Westerton Road, West Ardsley, 3456A Ardsley Reservoir,
1258 Westerton Road, Tingley, 3365 Westerton Road, Tingley,
1032 Bradford Road, 1143B & 1143D Thorpe Lane, Tingley.
Objections.

The Core Strategy seeks to be "fair". The word is used in paragraph 1.2 and again in 1.14. Yet the proposed green housing sites when taken together would definitely not be fair to West Ardsley and Tingley. No justification has been given as to why there is such a concentration here, nor any evidence of local need. Indeed, paragraph 4.6.14 states that "The SHMA 2011 was not able to identify any geographically specific need for new housing based on population growth." The 13 green housing sites in Ardsley and Tingley seem to have been assessed individually rather than their cumulative impact. This impact is potentially very much greater when considered alongside Kirklees Council's proposals for the Chidswell area, and comes on top of the huge impact on West Ardsley of major housing development in the 1990s - the estates now accessed by Lowry Road and Constable Road. The newly proposed sites taken together would consolidate semi-rural groups of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area. Most of the open frontages to Bradford Road and Westerton Road would be built on, removing open aspects and distant views and tending towards the creation of amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the length of the A650.

Site 3373C. Additional objections

1. Development of this site would be contrary to the following sections of the Council's policy SP1 in the Core Strategy:

SP1 (i) states: "Smaller Settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlement's size, function and sustainability."

Site 3373C, with its estimated capacity of 144 dwellings, does not have regard to the size, function and sustainability of West Ardsley.

SP1 (iii) states: "For development to respect and enhance the local character and identity of places and neighbourhoods". The local character and identity of West Ardsley would be seriously threatened by 3373C, especially when combined with sites 3373A, 536, 3456A and 1336, and would make its component areas of Upper Green, Haigh Moor and Hill Top barely distinguishable from each other.

Three letters from the Planning Inspectorate were used in the Council's own evidence to the Unitary Development Plan public inquiry in 1995. In paragraph 39 of his report on the Morley Local Plan, the inspector considered that the planned development at Haigh Wood (site WA2H) would have a "very serious impact upon the character and environment of West Ardsley". He concluded in paragraph 10: "In the past, development in the Morley area would appear to have been sporadic and opportunist, placing the identity of the smaller settlements at risk and tending towards the creation of amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the length of the A650 Bradford to Wakefield road. In my view, the further diffusion of the existing loosely-knit settlement pattern should, as far as possible, be resisted."

Considering appeals in 1986 on 81/23/00212 and 81/23/00213 (broadly the same area as LDF sites 3373A/B/C and 1336) the inspector said "It would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This was endorsed in the Secretary of State's decision letter.

In 1994, a third inspector dismissed an appeal to develop land at Arthington Close near the the edge of Haigh Wood because it would "unacceptably erode the fringe of this rural area and would lead to pressure for further encroachment of residential development, most particularly in the fields to the west..."

Although some years have passed since these decisions, the character and environment of the area are still semi-rural and just as delicate.

When cogent arguments have been repeatedly made against development of the 3373 areas by the Secretary of State, by three planning inspectors and by Leeds Council itself (in evidence to the UDP inquiry), there can be no justification for sites 3373A, 3373C and 1336 being pursued for residential development in the LDF. They should instead be reclassified as "red" and withdrawn from consideration for development when producing the next stage of the plan.

2. Schools. Primary and secondary schools already full and difficult to expand further.

3. Agricultural land. Good quality agricultural land would be lost.

Representation ID: REP05648 Question Ref: H1

Local Development Framework, Site Allocations Plan, Public Consultation.

I am making my response by letter; the online boxes rejected my comments because they exceed 3,000 digits.

3373A Haigh Wood, West Ardsley, 3373C Haigh Wood, West Ardsley,
1336 Westerton Road, West Ardsley, 3456A Ardsley Reservoir,
1258 Westerton Road, Tingley, 3365 Westerton Road, Tingley,
1032 Bradford Road, 1143B & 1143D Thorpe Lane, Tingley.
Objections.

The Core Strategy seeks to be "fair". The word is used in paragraph 1.2 and again in 1.14. Yet the proposed green housing sites when taken together would definitely not be fair to West Ardsley and Tingley. No justification has been given as to why there is such a concentration here, nor any evidence of local need. Indeed, paragraph 4.6.14 states that "The SHMA 2011 was not able to identify any geographically specific need for new housing based on population growth." The 13 green housing sites in Ardsley and Tingley seem to have been assessed individually rather than their cumulative impact. This impact is potentially very much greater when considered alongside Kirklees Council's proposals for the Chidswell area, and comes on top of the huge impact on West Ardsley of major housing development in the 1990s - the estates now accessed by Lowry Road and Constable Road. The newly proposed sites taken together would consolidate semi-rural groups of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area. Most of the open frontages to Bradford Road and Westerton Road would be built on, removing open aspects and distant views and tending towards the creation of amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the length of the A650.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Jack Spirrett

Representor No: PRS01869

Representation ID: REP04041 Question Ref: H1

The site is unsuitable for the following reasons:

- 1. Limited access to the site.
- 2. If Hill Top Lane is considered for access the following problems exist
 - a. Narrow road unsuitable for heavy or fast moving motor vehicles.
 - b. Open plan development.
 - c. Congestion issues at junction of Hill Top Land and Batley Road.
 - d. Incapable of managing current traffic flow at junction.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: S Hunter

Representor No: PRS01911

Representation ID: REP06974 Question Ref: H1

3373A & 3373C - Green to Red

We object for the following reasons:

We live only 320 metres from Hill Top School, having moved here in November 2010 we have been unable to place our now 7 year old son at the school due to it being full. We have been at the top of the waiting list for several terms, but have been unable to get him into the school. We have also been unable to get our son into Westerton primary the 2nd nearest primary school. The only school that can be offered are poor performing schools out of the area. Where are additional families going to send their children to school - out of the area, driving them to school and increasing traffic! Access via Hill Top Lane will lead to a significant increase in traffic, the reason for moving to this area was to be away from traffic and to live somewhere where it is safe for children to play. Making Hill Top Lane a through road would not be safe for young children.

At the junction at the end of Hill Top Lane it is already extremely difficult to turn right onto Batley Road, this is due to Batley Road already carrying heavy traffic, there is a blind corner and hill to the right and there are always cars parked opposite the junction meaning that you have to drive on the wrong side of the road round a corner meeting the brow of a hill.

Turning right out of Hill Top Grove onto Hill Top Lane has very poor visibility due to a large tree, increased traffic will cause difficulty in safely turning right onto Hill Top Lane. West Ardsley is a sleepy village with very little other than housing and woodland in the area. People live here in order to enjoy the surrounding countryside and woodland and the wildlife it has to offer. Not only will building in the area destroy the enjoyment residents have in the countryside and wildlife, but as there is so little in the area to do i.e. Healthcare, Shops, Parks, Fitness, Children's Entertainment, any new houses would lead to increased traffic as residents have to drive to find these things.

As an example our closest doctors surgery is at East Ardsley 2 miles drive from our home. To book an appointment, there is generally a 2 week wait just to get a routine appointment. What is proposed to cope with the additional demand on doctors surgeries and health services or will we now need to wait several more weeks just to get a routine appointment?

The wildlife in the area is quite special, we regularly have Jays visiting our garden, quite rare for these shy birds. There are many, many different species of birds in the areas, hedgehogs, foxes, what is proposed to protect these creatures?

In summary the residents of West Ardsley live here purely to enjoy wildlife, countryside, lack of traffic and tolerate the fact that they must travel out of the area for everything including for ourselves a school! To remove the wildlife, countryside and increase traffic and number of residents WOULD RUIN THIS AREA AND THE LIVES OF THE RESIDENTS!

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: S Hunter

Representor No: PRS01911

Representation ID: REP04087 Question Ref: H1

3373A / 3373C -

We are disgusted that as residents who live directly adjacent to 3373C we received no notification of these proposals and it was down to a neighbour who called at our house yesterday to make us aware and also that the closing date for submitting comments is Monday 29th July!

We object for the following reasons:

We live only 320 metres from Hill Top School, having moved here in November 2010 we have been unable to place our now 7 year old son at the school due to it being full. We have been at the top of the waiting list for several terms, but have been unable to get him into the school. We have also been unable to get our son into Westerton primary the 2nd nearest primary school. The only school that can be offered are poor performing schools out of the area. Where are additional families going to send their children to school - out of the area, driving them to school and increasing traffic!

Access via Hill Top Lane will lead to a significant increase in traffic, the reason for moving to this area was to be away from traffic and to live somewhere where it is safe for children to play. Making Hill Top Lane a through road would not be safe for young children.

At the junction at the end of Hill Top Lane it is already extremely difficult to turn right onto Batley Road, this is due to Batley Road already carrying heavy traffic, there is a blind corner and hill to the right and there are always cars parked opposite the junction meaning that you have to drive on the wrong side of the road round a corner meeting the brow of a hill.

Turning right out of Hill Top Grove onto Hill Top Lane has very poor visibility due to a large tree, increased traffic will cause difficulty in safely turning right onto Hill Top Lane.

West Ardsley is a sleepy village with very little other than housing and woodland in the area. People live here in order to enjoy the surrounding countryside and woodland and the wildlife it has to offer.

Not only will building in the area destroy the enjoyment residents have in the countryside and wildlife, but as there is so little in the area to do i.e. Healthcare, Shops, Parks, Fitness, Children's Entertainment, any new houses would lead to increased traffic as residents have to drive to find these things.

As an example our closest doctors surgery is at East Ardsley 2 miles drive from our home. To book an appointment, there is generally a 2 week wait just to get a routine appointment. What is proposed to cope with the additional demand on doctors surgeries and health services or will we now need to wait several more weeks just to get a routine appointment?

The wildlife in the area is quite special, we regularly have Jays visiting our garden, quite rare for these shy birds. There are many, many different species of birds in the areas, hedgehogs, foxes, what is proposed to protect these creatures?

In summary the residents of West Ardsley live here purely to enjoy wildlife, countryside, lack of traffic and tolerate the fact that they must travel out of the area for everything including for ourselves a school! To remove the wildlife, countryside and increase traffic and number of residents WOULD RUIN THIS AREA AND THE LIVES OF THE RESIDENTS!

We have completed the relevant forms on the [leeds.gov.uk](https://www.leeds.gov.uk) website and I trust that as my local MP you will represent my views at the relevant hearings/meetings and do what you can to prevent this proposal going ahead.

Name: Caroline Proctor

Representor No: PRS02096

Representation ID: REP04315 Question Ref: H9

3373C – This is a valuable green space with access to Haigh Wood. It should be protected as countryside. Also the number of houses planned would overwhelm the area.

Representation ID: REP04315 Question Ref: H2

3373C – This land should be green belt not just open land together with sites 3373A / B it forms a valuable green space for residents of West Ardsley / Tingley and access to Haigh Wood.

Also the extra 144 houses would generate a high volume of extra traffic onto already busy (for small roads) Haigh Moor and Westerton Road.

Name: J Cowie

Representor No: PRS02227

Representation ID: REP04768 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Susan Holt

Representor No: PRS02289

Representation ID: REP04772 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Name: Dereck Holt

Representor No: PRS02311

Representation ID: REP04766 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Name: Jenni Davenport

Representor No: PRS02330

Representation ID: REP04770 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Name: Frank Raven

Representor No: PRS02339

Representation ID: REP04771 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Name: E Naylor

Representor No: PRS02363

Representation ID: REP04780 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Name: Kathleen Paver

Representor No: PRS02372

Representation ID: REP04774 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: C Guy

Representor No: PRS02377

Representation ID: REP04767 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Name: Peter Hoyland

Representor No: PRS02399

Representation ID: REP04657 Question Ref: H1

The site is unsuitable for the following reason:

1. Limited access to the site.
2. If Hill Top Lane is considered for access the following problems exist.
 - a) Narrow road unsuitable for heavy or fast moving motor vehicles.
 - b) Open plan development,
 - c) Congestion issues at junction of Hill Top Lane and Batley Road.
 - d) Junction at c incapable of managing traffic flow.
 - e) Parking congestion as junction Hill Top Lane and Batley Road at peak times due to parking issues and children attending/leaving Hill Top Infants School.
3. There is a real danger that if additional motor vehicles use this junction that a serious road traffic accident, probably involving a child id just waiting to happen.
4. There is a dangerous comer near the junction on Hill Top Lane and Batley Road where drivers have poor sight lines.
5. Such Development would infringe on current existing local designated footpaths.
6. The designated area is not suitable for residential development.

Name: C Clegg

Representor No: PRS02406

Representation ID: REP04663 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Name: Doreen Gill

Representor No: PRS02496

Representation ID: REP04755 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Name: D Naylor

Representor No: PRS02497

Representation ID: REP04773 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: A Paver

Representor No: PRS02498

Representation ID: REP04775 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Name: James Bowers

Representor No: PRS02500

Representation ID: REP04777 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Name: Alan Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02501

Representation ID: REP04778 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Name: Vivienne Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02502

Representation ID: REP04779 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Name: Vivian Oxtoby

Representor No: PRS02504

Representation ID: REP04783 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Name: Beryl Hewitt

Representor No: PRS02506

Representation ID: REP04785 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: D A Clegg

Representor No: PRS02507

Representation ID: REP04788 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Name: Pauline Wood

Representor No: PRS02508

Representation ID: REP04790 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Name: Joyce Thompson

Representor No: PRS02510

Representation ID: REP04792 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Name: Patricia Aston

Representor No: PRS02513

Representation ID: REP04796 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Name: L. G Wilson

Representor No: PRS02515

Representation ID: REP04799 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Name: S Laurence

Representor No: PRS02517

Representation ID: REP04801 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: C Graham

Representor No: PRS02518

Representation ID: REP04803 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Name: M Allsop

Representor No: PRS02520

Representation ID: REP04805 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Name: R Hartill

Representor No: PRS02521

Representation ID: REP04806 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Name: Edith Holmes

Representor No: PRS02522

Representation ID: REP04808 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Name: Harry Holmes

Representor No: PRS02524

Representation ID: REP04811 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Name: Ann Morse

Representor No: PRS02526

Representation ID: REP04813 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: L.r Morse

Representor No: PRS02527

Representation ID: REP04816 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Name: Michael Hartill

Representor No: PRS02556

Representation ID: REP04847 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Name: Jim Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02561

Representation ID: REP04852 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Name: Helen Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02562

Representation ID: REP04855 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Name: Ronald Gill

Representor No: PRS02564

Representation ID: REP04858 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Name: A.w Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02565

Representation ID: REP04859 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: J Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02566

Representation ID: REP04860 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Name: Norman Dearden

Representor No: PRS02568

Representation ID: REP04857 Question Ref: H1

3373C Haigh Wood S, West Ardsley, Site Capacity 144, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

The same concerns for the welfare of the wood apply to this site (This is an important buffer area to ensure adequate water supply to Haigh wood. Diverting rainwater from the wood could lead to the trees failing to thrive.). Access is via an existing development but leads on to Batley Road where sight lines are not good and the road is busy, especially at peak times. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition. The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1234.

Name: Edna M Buchanan-dick

Representor No: PRS02835

Representation ID: REP05387 Question Ref: H7

My objections to this development are;

1. Volume of traffic on Hilltop Lane (too narrow) leading onto Batley Road
2. Noise and car exhaust pollution from volume of traffic expected

Name: Annie McNally

Representor No: PRS03059

Representation ID: REP00387 Question Ref: G1

I think it is disgusting that the council are wanting to build on greenbelt land on proposed Plots 1336, 3373, 3372, 3373A, 3373B, 3373C, 1330B, 1330A, 536. And 3456A. It is an area of outstanding beauty where people enjoy walking, running, playing and riding horses. Many wild animals live in the fields and to take it away would turn this area into a concrete jungle. It would mean my view at the back would be eradicated, lowering the value of my house, but more importantly the pleasure I have everyday when I look across the field. This city needs green areas where we can walk and get away from the stresses of life. Also, to the rear of my property there is bindweed in the field which I believe would make it difficult for any developers to be able to build on that land. There are plenty of brown field sites which can be developed. Do not take away our green spaces. Totally outrageous.

Name: Gary Lunn

Representor No: PRS03128

Representation ID: REP01153 Question Ref: H1

New housing developments already under way on Haigh Moor Road. Further development will create increased access problems for traffic.-I have concerns about road safety due to the increased level of traffic that will arise and access roads through current housing developments will put children in particular at risk.-Schools in the immediate vicinity are generally full. Where will extra children go.-Local doctors already been extended substantially in recent years to deal with increased population. Further housing development will only increase pressure on this resource.-It will be the loss of a local amenity enjoyed by many-Wildlife is plentiful in this area and adds to the enjoyment of many as well as providing habitat to animals and birds. Numerous bats can be seen in the area on an evening, these will be lost

Representation ID: REP01153 Question Ref: H7

Maintain green belt land but also development of this area would be difficult, costly and unpractical due to gradient of land

Representation ID: REP01153 Question Ref: H2

3373A & 337C

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Claire Hunter

Representor No: PRS03251

Representation ID: REP01159 Question Ref: H1

We live only 320 metres from Hill Top School, having moved here in November 2010 we have been unable to place our now 7 year old son at the school due to it being full. We have been at the top of the waiting list for several terms, but have been unable to get him into the school. We have also been unable to get our son into Westerton primary the 2nd nearest primary school. The only school that can be offered are poor performing schools out of the area. Where are additional families going to send their children to school - out of the area, driving them to school and increasing traffic! Access via Hill Top Lane will lead to a significant increase in traffic, the reason for moving to this area was to be away from traffic and to live somewhere where it is safe for children to play. Making Hill Top Lane a through road would not be safe for young children. At the junction at the end of Hill Top Lane it is already extremely difficult to turn right onto Batley Road, this is due to Batley Road already carrying heavy traffic, there is a blind corner and hill to the right and there are always cars parked opposite the junction meaning that you have to drive on the wrong side of the road round a corner meeting the brow of a hill. Turning right out of Hill Top Grove onto Hill Top Lane has very poor visibility due to a large tree, increased traffic will cause difficulty in safely turning right onto Hill Top Lane. West Ardsley is a sleepy village with very little other than housing and woodland in the area. People live here in order to enjoy the surrounding countryside and woodland and the wildlife it has to offer. Not only will building in the area destroy the enjoyment residents have in the countryside and wildlife, but as there is so little in the area to do i.e. Healthcare, Shops, Parks, Fitness, Children's Entertainment, any new houses would lead to increased traffic as residents have to drive to find these things. As an example our closest doctors surgery is at East Ardsley 2 miles drive from our home. To book an appointment, there is generally a 2 week wait just to get a routine appointment. What is proposed to cope with the additional demand on doctors surgeries and health services or will we now need to wait several more weeks just to get a routine appointment? The wildlife in the area is quite special, we regularly have Jays visiting our garden, quite rare for these shy birds. There are many, many different species of birds in the areas, hedgehogs, foxes, what is proposed to protect these creatures? In summary the residents of West Ardsley live here purely to enjoy wildlife, countryside, lack of traffic and tolerate the fact that they must travel out of the area for everything including for ourselves a school! To remove the wildlife, countryside and increase traffic and number of residents WOULD RUIN THIS AREA AND THE LIVES OF THE RESIDENTS!

Representation ID: REP01159 Question Ref: H5

Map 33 Site 3373 A & C

Representation ID: REP01159 Question Ref: H8

Map 33 site 3373 A & C

Representation ID: REP01159 Question Ref: H9

Map 33 site 3373 A & C

Representation ID: REP01159 Question Ref: H2

Map 33 Site 3373 A & C The reason is given above, however summarised as: Access & Road Safety Issues from Hill Top Grove onto Hill Top Lane and from Hill Top Lane onto Batley Road. Increase traffic to an area not designed for traffic, some streets do not even have a pavement! Lack of schools and healthcare in the area to cope with existing demand. Wildlife and Countryside is the only thing West Ardsley has to offer and the only reason people choose to live here. Building on the green areas will ruin the area and the lives of residents.

Name: Stephen Wild

Representor No: PRS03279

Representation ID: REP00620 Question Ref: H2

3373C. This is a green field site. It is, physically, green fields. Access will not be sufficient if it is intended to use Hill Top Lane, which is already congested with resident parking. Local schools are already full, and services for local residents (shops etc) are poor - additional housing will not help. The distinction between 3373C and 3373B seems arbitrary: in open character of the countryside around Haigh Wood is part of the landscape as much worth preserving as the woods themselves.

Name: Michael Short

Representor No: PRS03336

Representation ID: REP00155 Question Ref: H2

3373A: suggested access via narrow, badly designed estate roads which are about adequate to service the existing housing. The site, in parts, is probably not economical to develop (topography, drainage, old mines etc). Will entail removal of many trees which form part of a pleasant, wooded local amenity. If developed, the character of this space (a quiet valley) will be ruined. Applying to 3373A and also 3373C, 1336 and 1337: Local roads already saturated, no places in schools or GPs, massive development will ruin the village; feel of the area.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Richard Sagar

Representor No: PRS03405

Representation ID: REP01941 Question Ref: H1

Whilst we are in broad agreement with the designation of green sites at Haigh Wood in the Outer South West area of Leeds, we have concerns regarding the boundaries between the "green" and "red" sites. We agree with and support the allocation of land at Haigh Wood for housing with a central area in the vicinity of Haigh Wood LNA left undisturbed, but feel that this primary objective can be better achieved with different boundaries to sites 3373A, 3373B, 3373C and 1336

Representation ID: REP01941 Question Ref: H3

As a corollary to the explanation provided at H2 and in the attached document, we suggest that parts of site 3373B be re-designated as green, in accordance with Figure 6 and Appendix 1 of that document. These sections are in areas which are not needed to be kept undeveloped for the preservation of the green corridor between the two development parcels. New access points, via Upper Green Avenue/Upper Green Way and a new junction onto Westerton Road will facilitate improved integration into the transport network. As mentioned above, the alignment of site 3373B would be more logical if it followed the suggested revised indicative masterplan included in the attached document (at Figure 6 and Appendix 1). The green corridor will be further protected by the removal of the previously suggested vehicular link road between the two parts of the Haigh Wood site. The new alignment will preserve the vast majority of the hedges and existing trees on the site, whilst allowing a more logical and achievable layout for future development. Additionally, no development is proposed within the vicinity of the LNA or the stream running down the valley.

Representation ID: REP01941 Question Ref: H8

As explained at H3 and in the attached documents, we believe that sections of site 3337B should be re-designated as green, instead of parts of site 1336 and 3373A.

Representation ID: REP01941 Question Ref: H9

As explained at H2 and in the attached documents, we suggest that parts of sites 1336 and 3373A would be more suitable for colour coding as red, whilst parts of site 3373B should be green.

Representation ID: REP01941 Question Ref: H11

The suggested revised allocations at Haigh Wood (see Figure 6 and Appendix 1 of the attached document) ("green" land) are all suitable for short term delivery.

Representation ID: REP01941 Question Ref: H2

We agree with the Council that the central valley at Haigh Wood should be excluded from development, as a green corridor between proposed development sites. This was the Council's intention in designating site 3373B as red. However, the alignment of the valley suggested by site 3373B does not accurately reflect the topography of the area, the trees, the stream and the LNA and how these will affect potential development, nor does it align with what we suggest is the true extent of the central valley. We therefore suggest that sections of sites 3373A and 1336 be re-designated as red, in accordance with the attached documents (Document for Residential and Open Space Allocation Addendum dated July 2013, in particular Figure 6 and Appendix 1, and the covering letter) outlining the detailed justification for our proposed new alignment for the central valley. The sections of sites 3373A and 1336 which we suggest are re-designated as red are not suitable for development, as they incorporate important arboricultural features which will be difficult to incorporate into a housing development and are best left as part of the green corridor between the two development parcels. Conversely, parts of site 3373B should be added as green, not red, for similar reasons, but in reverse; the area can be developed without harm to what is sought to be protected, as further explained below.

Name: Stephen Bartlett

Representor No: PRS03513

Representation ID: REP01397 Question Ref: H2

3373A, 3373C and 536. If you go ahead and build on these sites, it has been stated that Haigh wood would act as a pleasant area of "green belt" for recreational purposes. The area of wood that you are talking about is barely wider than 100m and probably no longer than 500m in length!! The other reasons I have given in detail above in that I am worried this area is going to become an urban sprawl, with no parkland (albeit we have the reservoir) designated anywhere. Small thin strips of land between developments are not my idea of recreational areas - if you develop this area, then I believe you should be looking at putting in areas similar to Middleton or Roundhay park. I also don't agree with your assessment of site 1135 off Dewsbury road. Your statement should say - too costly for any developer to clear the station area, therefore not a viable proposition!!! Yes we all know it's far easier to pick a nice green field, scrape off the top soil, lay foundations, and build (for maximum profit)

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: John Simpson

Representor No: PRS03606

Representation ID: REP00788 Question Ref: H1

Existing road access is far too narrow to accommodate any further traffic. Also any further construction so close to Haigh Wood, would inevitably harm the protected woodland and wildlife.

Representation ID: REP00788 Question Ref: General comment

I hope that planners will give my comments careful consideration .

Representation ID: REP00788 Question Ref: H2

Site Ref 3373C Haigh Wood West ArdsleyOur home backs onto the open field, any future development would seriously impact on our privacy. We live in a bungalow and any houses built in the field would have a full overlooking view into two of our bedroom windows and into our garden.As previous stated Hill Top Lane, which is the only access road to the site is very narrow,people coming to collect children from Hill Top School park cars up to half way up the Lane which already causes an issue for residents coming and going at school times. I do not feel that more traffic on Hill Top Lane can be absorbed with out it creating major problems.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Camille Leach

Representor No: PRS03615

Representation ID: REP00848 Question Ref: H9

site 3373A and 3373c should be coded red for all the issues previously stated plus site 3373A Lee gap Fair is held twice a year in these fields, the fair is the oldest horse fair in England dating back to 1136 and forms part of the history and heritage of the area.site 3373C It can be argued that the highways infrastructure for Site 3373B is inadequate, there are Highways concerns re poor accessibility for the number of houses proposed and then there is the issue of Highways safety with the junction of Hilltop Lane being within 100 metres of the primary school.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Camille Leach

Representor No: PRS03615

Representation ID: REP00848

Question Ref: General comment

Site 3373C Objections1. Local character and identityDevelopment of this site would be contrary to the following sections of the Council's policy SP1 in the Core Strategy:1. SP1 (i) states: "Smaller Settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlement's size, function and sustainability." Site 3373A, with its estimated capacity of 130 dwellings, does not have regard to the size, function and sustainability of West Ardsley.SP1 (iii) states: "For development to respect and enhance the local character and identity of places and neighbourhoods". The local character and identity of West Ardsley would be seriously threatened by 3373a, 3373C and 1336, and would make its component areas of Upper Green, Haigh Moor and Hill Top barely distinguishable from each other.My view accords with three decision letters from the Planning Inspectorate which were used in the Council's own evidence to the Unitary Development Plan public inquiry in 1995. In paragraph 39 of his report on the Morley Local Plan, the inspector considered that the planned development at Haigh Wood (site WA2H) would have a "very serious impact upon the character and environment of West Ardsley". He concluded in paragraph 10: "In the past, development in the Morley area would appear to have been sporadic and opportunist, placing the identity of the smaller settlements at risk and tending towards the creation of amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the length of the A650 Bradford to Wakefield road. In my view, the further diffusion of the existing loosely-knit settlement pattern should, as far as possible, be resisted."Considering appeals in 1986 on 81/23/00212 and 81/23/00213 (broadly the same area as LDF sites 3373A/B/C and 1336) the inspector said "It would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This was endorsed in the Secretary of State's decision letter.In 1994, a third inspector dismissed an appeal to develop land at Arthington Close near the the edge of Haigh Wood because it would "unacceptably erode the fringe of this rural area and would lead to pressure for further encroachment of residential development, most particularly in the fields to the west..."Although some years have passed since these decisions, the character and environment of the area are still semi-rural and just as delicate. When cogent arguments have been repeatedly made against development of the 3373 areas by the Secretary of State, by three planning inspectors and by Leeds Council itself (in evidence to the UDP inquiry), there can be no justification for sites 3373A, 3373C and 1336 being pursued for residential development in the LDF. They should instead be reclassified as "red" and withdrawn from consideration for development when producing the next stage of the plan.2. Damage to Haigh Wood and Baghill beck valleyDevelopment of this site would be contrary to the Council's policy P12 in the Core Strategy:"The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes, including their historical and cultural significance, will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness through stewardship and the planning process." The secluded Haigh Wood valley comprises the central portion of site 3373A, including part of the wood covered by a Tree Preservation Order. Residential development would prejudice the objectives underlining this policy as set out in paragraphs 5.3.46 to 5.3.48 of the Core Strategy including: "The Council seeks to protect and enhance the varied landscapes of Leeds and the assets they contain, from valued local trees, the countryside to nationally designated landscape, fauna and flora". This view was endorsed by three planning inspectors and again in the Council's evidence, given by Mr G B Andrews, at the UDP inquiry. In his paragraph 4.3.6, Mr Andrews stated: I refer to the conclusions reached by the inspectors at the two subsequent appeal cases in 1985 and 1994. In each case it is acknowledged that the Haigh Wood area is of value as an area of attractive open farmland with a rural character and provides an important amenity in the local area". Even the Council's own assessment for the LDF states that the site is: "Not supported (RED). This site includes Haigh Wood and Baghill Beck Local Nature Area which fall under UK Biological Action Plan priority habitats - a mixture of woodland, scrub and grassland habitats alongside Baghill Beck. There are a number of wide hedgerow/woodland belts throughout the site that provide a valuable habitat. Water vole has been recorded on the Hey Beck. The Baghill Beck flows into this water course and could support this species. Bats to consider."3. FairnessThe Core Strategy seeks to be "fair". The word is used in paragraph 1.2 and again in 1.14. Yet the proposed green housing sites when taken together would definitely not be fair to West Ardsley and Tingley. No justification has been given as to why there is such a concentration here, nor any evidence of local need. Indeed, paragraph 4.6.14 states that "The SHMA 2011 was not able to identify any geographically specific need for new housing based on population growth." The sites seem to have been assessed individually rather than their cumulative impact. This impact is potentially very much greater when considered alongside Kirklees Council's proposals for the Chidswell area. 4. Highway access The Upper Green culs-de-sac and Hill Top Lane cul-de-sacs are not suitable to serve more houses. They would become much less safe for children to play in and the already severe dangers at school times would be exacerbated.5. SchoolsPrimary and secondary schools already full and difficult to expand further.6. Agricultural landGood quality agricultural land would be lost.7. ViabilityExtra costs from: a. parts of 3373A and 3373C have serious levels problems and look undevelopable; b. bell pits known to exist in the area from former mining; c. elimination of Japanese Knotweed.The site on Westerton Road from Regency Gardens to Westerton Wood if developed will see 117 new homes - this land is currently classed as green belt (site 3365 = 83 homes and site 1258 = 34 homes) development here will represent a major incursion into the Green belt and will create further pressure on Ardsley reservoir as a local beauty spot. Development of sites 3365 and 1258 will result in the loss of valuable agricultural land, there are a number of wide hedgerow and woodland belts throughout the site that provide a valuable habitat for wildlife in particular bats. Development of the sites on Westerton Road will result in the amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the whole length of the Westerton Road.Site 1330B is an extension of the building that is currently ongoing adjacent to Jude's pond - and is for a further 32 houses ! This site has major highways access issues and has less than the recommended visibility splay for highways safety - further development of this site will exasperate current problems regarding drainage on the land - Haigh Moor Road residents already have to deal with flooding of the pavements and highways in the vicinity of Jude's pond. 464 houses in such a small vicinity is unsustainable, there are currently just over 300 pupils at Hill Top Primary School with no room for any expansion, the school is full and the same is true of Westerton which as you know was a small village school 20 years ago but is now one of the biggest primary schools in the Leeds district and all because of the amount of building that has taken place over recent years.Leeds City Council have in their allocation plan confirmed that Ardsley and Robin Hood have a deficiency in parks and gardens (the only area in Leeds South West to be deficient) - our children already have very little designated play areas, they have also confirmed that we are deficient in outdoor sports areas and facilities for children to play. We have however got a surplus of natural green space which is currently under threat of housing - if this natural greenspace is to be used for any purpose, surely it should be used to reduce the deficit and improve our community. Further reduction of amenity greenspace in an area which is seeing more and more housing development is unfair and unsustainable.Our GP surgeries are at breaking point with current waiting times for appointments being in excess of two weeks, the surgery at Leigh View was recently extended and it's difficult to envisage how this could be extended further to serve the population boom that will ensue if all these sites are developed.Further erosion of the demarcation between West Ardsley & Tingley - soon the two settlements will merge into one and West Ardsley as a separate community will be subsumed into its near neighbour, the two areas will be barely distinguishable from each other which is contrary to the Councils policy SP1 which clearly states smaller Settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlement's size, function and sustainability. If these plans were approved it will no doubt result in urban sprawl with no identifiable boundaries.Our fields provide a public amenity for dog-walkers, cyclists, ramblers and local residents alike and It would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This view was endorsed by the Secretary of State in their past decision letter.Our road network was not built to support the existing volume of traffic , we do not have the infrastructure to support development of this scale, our public transport links are very poor with only one bus an hour into Leeds, the only viable means of transportation is by car which will have a cumulative impact on the A650 and A653 which are already congested.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Camille Leach

Representor No: PRS03615

Representation ID: REP00848 Question Ref: H2

Objections to 3373a and 3373cDevelopment of these sites would be contrary to SP1 in the Core Strategy:SP1 (i) No regard to the size, function and sustainability of West Ardsley.SP1 (iii) The local character and identity of West Ardsley would be seriously threatened by 3373A, 3373C and 1336, and would make the areas of Upper Green, Haigh Moor and Hill Top undistinguishable from each other. Three decision letters from the Planning Inspectorate which were used in the Council's own evidence to the UDP in 1995. In paragraph 39 of his report he considered the planned development concluding "In the past, development in the Morley area would appear to have been sporadic and opportunist, placing the identity of the smaller settlements at risk and tending towards the creation of amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the length of the A650.In my view, the further diffusion of the existing loosely-knit settlement pattern should be resisted."Appeals in 1986 on 81/23/00212 and 81/23/00213 the inspector said "It would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This was endorsed in the Secretary of State's decision letter.When cogent arguments have been repeatedly made against development of the 3373 areas by the Secretary of State, by three planning inspectors and by Leeds Council itself (in evidence to the UDP inquiry), there can be no justification for sites 3373A, 3373C and 1336 being pursued for residential development in the LDF. They should instead be reclassified as "red" Development of these sites would be contrary to the Council's policy P12 in the Core Strategy: The secluded Haigh Wood valley comprises the central portion of site 3373A, including part of the wood covered by a Tree Preservation Order. Residential development would prejudice the objectives underlining this policy as set out in paragraphs 5.3.46 to 5.3.48 of the Core Strategy.

Name: Emyr Phillips

Representor No: PRS03789

Representation ID: REP01163 Question Ref: H2

I particularly disagree with site 3373C as new roads could cause the current cul-de-sac design to become a rat run; the roads are not sufficient to cope.Finally, there will be a great loss of amenities to local people, damage to wild life in Haigh Moor Wood and the effect on property values of existing homes.Having lived on Hill Top Estate for over 25 years, I am concerned these plans will affect the friendly village ethos and community spirit.

Name: Roy Wagstaff

Representor No: PRS04064

Representation ID: REP01469 Question Ref: H2

Site Reference MAP 33, 3373 A-C.Access problems by increased road traffic to Hill Top Lane/Batley Road.Road safety concerns as access to site is close to primary school and on a bad bend. Access also affected by parked vehicles outside residences directly opposite Hill Top Lane.Ability of local services to cope with extra residents attending local schools and doctors surgeries; personal experience over last six years of just getting a routine doctors appointment has gone from two days to two weeks, due to previous developments in the area.Loss of these areas reduces public access to less formal recreational space and traffic free footpaths.These developments would undoubtedly have an impact on the local wildlife in Haigh Moor Wood.(eg.Bats).

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Robin Colvill

Representor No: PRS04071

Representation ID: REP01143 Question Ref: H1

Hill Top Lane is a lane not a wide road and would not be able to take the traffic for another 120 houses, the schools are all over full children are having to travel out of the area. wildlife , bats etc would be affected in the close by woods, walkers would not have the amenity anymore, the doctors surgery cannot handle the patients they have now with sometimes 3 weeks waiting for an appointment, road safety is a major concern as school time is a nightmare on Hill top lane with double parked cars already. Even if another exit on to Haig moor rd were to be made that in itself would cause even more problems as Haig more rd is constantly full of parked cars on both sides and a real hazard to negotiate. we are not talking about a small number of homes which would probably be ok but the amount of homes is far beyond the amount that the area can accomodate, I strongly disagree with any building on this field [x]

Representation ID: REP01143 Question Ref: H5

map 31 site 3373 A-C

Representation ID: REP01143 Question Ref: H6

for reasons already given in previous question

Representation ID: REP01143 Question Ref: H8

map31 site 3373 A-C for reasons already listed n previous 2 questions

Representation ID: REP01143 Question Ref: H9

map31 site 3373 A-C for reasons already listed n previous 2 questions

Representation ID: REP01143 Question Ref: H2

map31 site 3373 A-C

Name: Christine Leach

Representor No: PRS04208

Representation ID: REP01169 Question Ref: H2

sites 3365,1258 & 3373c Sites 3365 & 1258 are on green belt land & will also spoil Ardsley reservoir which is a local beauty spot used by many local people myself included as I walk round it almost every day, It is also used by lots of other people for leisure activities such as walking clubs It will also result in a loss of agricultural land & valuable hedgerows. Site 3373c Has insufficient highways infrastructure for yet another 144 houses & would mean that Tingley & West Ardsley could no longer remain as separate villages & the communities would lose one of its last valuable open sites for outdoor enjoyment.

Name: Sue Baker

Representor No: PRS04274

Representation ID: REP01764 Question Ref: G1

The suggestion to develop the area around Haigh Wood in West Ardsley is detrimental to the wood. This is a natural bluebell wood which is rare in this area. Increasing housing in close proximity will destroy the natural habitat. The area around West Ardsley reservoir is a prime example of over use by the local population and as such access will probably have to be closed due to damage. The same thing will happen to the wood as there will be even less greenspace for leisure. Part of the area is also covered by a mediaeval charter to allow Lee Fair to meet on the land yearly.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Michael Heath

Representor No: PRS04344

Representation ID: REP02081 Question Ref: G1

I wish to make reference to the LDP, map 31 site 3373A-C in that I have concerns re access problems by increased traffic; road safety concerns as we are close to the school; the ability of local services to cope in the event of a large influx of people; the loss of identity for the village (which has already had a vast number of additional houses in the last 10/15 years) and damage to wildlife in Haigh Moor Wood, if there is development such as proposed in this Plan.

Representation ID: REP02081 Question Ref: General comment

I wish to make reference to the LDP, map 31 site 3373A-C in that I have concerns re access problems by increased traffic; road safety concerns as we are close to the school; the ability of local services to cope in the event of a large influx of people; the loss of identity for the village (which has already had a vast number of additional houses in the last 10/15 years) and damage to wildlife in Haigh Moor Wood, if there is development such as proposed in this Plan.

Representation ID: REP02081 Question Ref: G7

I wish to make reference to the LDP, map 31 site 3373A-C in that I have concerns re access problems by increased traffic; road safety concerns as we are close to the school; the ability of local services to cope in the event of a large influx of people; the loss of identity for the village (which has already had a vast number of additional houses in the last 10/15 years) and damage to wildlife in Haigh Moor Wood, if there is development such as proposed in this Plan.

Name: Michael Bramley

Representor No: PRS04350

Representation ID: REP01455 Question Ref: H1

The areas 3373c & 3373a are not suitable for housing the area contains a large amount of bat colonies and the area is regarded by locals as a natural beauty spot with woods and fields that are a pleasure to share with the community. There are no services in West Ardsley to support a larger community, the junior school is not large enough, there is no shop and one postbox in the village even the village shop converted into flats 5 years ago. Batley Road, the road servicing West Ardsley already is used as a rat run between Dewsbury, Batley and Wakefield and nothing has been done to calm traffic and more housing would add to this. Additionally, road access to the areas would appear to be via the road Hill Top Lane. This road is not really designed or suitable as a major road artery. Hill Top Lane is regularly congested during start of school and end of school day as it is used as drop-off zone by parents, as the previously described Batley Road is too busy. This congestion is despite the local school having a car park and drop off area. Additional housing in the area will add to the congestion - both to the community and the ability for the local school to accommodate the additional child population.

Representation ID: REP01455 Question Ref: H5

As previously described 3373a & 3373c

Representation ID: REP01455 Question Ref: H2

We strongly disagree with the green belt of 3373c and 3373a being considered for housing because it will effect the natural beauty of this area, a main reason we moved here from Tingley which was allowed to over develop. We have observed the impact of overdevelopment where a large number of residential homes has a small amount of services (shops etc.) Our previous observations highlighted that in singular retail area, particularly at dusk, gets utilised by the local youngsters as a hang out as there is no where else to go - and resulting in a number of threatening and anti-social behaviour. The local area is used heavily by families as an area for taking walks - simply due to the fact that this is the ONLY safe area without using transport in the immediate district. Equally, 3373A hosts a long standing traditional event (100s years) called the the LeeFair horse show. From our own person perspective - our property overlooks 3373C and this vista presents a value-add to our property. Our property is situated on Hill Top Lane. The proposed development will have a double impact on reducing the value of our property - Hill Top Lane will become a main road rather than a quiet cul-de-sac. And the Vista our property currently enjoys will be taken away and enjoyed by the new development - this impact could be many 10's of thousands pounds in value loss

Name: Alison Brice

Representor No: PRS04365

Representation ID: REP00325 Question Ref: H11

3373a and c -long term -preferable never

Representation ID: REP00325 Question Ref: H2

Sites: 3373a and 3373c (agree 3373b should be red) Also query 536. With sites 3373a and c I am concerned about the access - if Hill Top Lane is used the road isn't wide and the junction with Batley Road has long been a concern. Cars park directly opposite the junction (terraced houses no drives) and on both sides of Hill Top Lane - especially of concern is school pick up and drop off parking - I am surprised there hasn't been a serious accident with children from Hill Top School and speed is also a concern. If more traffic on the road accessing or cutting through the risk is so much greater. The houses were built with covenants against hedges etc to preserve sight lines.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Julia Jackson

Representor No: PRS04558

Representation ID: REP01205 Question Ref: H2

3373C I am concerned about: 1. Access to the site, the junction of Hill Top Lane and Batley Road is already very busy and dangerous at school times. Added traffic would make it even worse. 2. I have neighbours who are already struggling to get their children into Hill Top School. More houses will exacerbate the problem. Just how close do you have to live to the school to get your child a place? 3. The field is often used by dog walkers and children. Losing this amenity would be bad for the village. 4. There is lots of wildlife in the area which would be damaged with building on the site. Bats are regularly seen around the houses in the locality. 5. Increased noise on Hill Top Lane is of concern, the Lane was not designed to take huge amounts of traffic is totally unsuitable.

Name: Samantha Halls

Representor No: PRS04583

Representation ID: REP00646 Question Ref: H1

1. Local character and identity/Development of site would be contrary to the following sections of the Council's policy SP1 in the Core Strategy: - Site 3373A, with its estimated capacity of 130 dwellings, does not have regard to the size, function and sustainability of West Ardsley. SP1 (iii) states: "For development to respect and enhance the local character and identity of places and neighbourhoods". The local character and identity of West Ardsley would be seriously threatened by 3373A, especially when combined with sites 3373C and 1336, and would make its component areas of Upper Green, Haigh Moor and Hill Top barely distinguishable from each other. My view accords with three decision letters from the Planning Inspectorate which were used in the Council's own evidence to the Unitary Development Plan public inquiry in 1995. In paragraph 39 of his report on Morley Local Plan, the inspector considered the planned development at Haigh Wood (site WA2H) would have a "very serious impact upon the character and environment of West Ardsley". He concluded paragraph 10: "In the past, development in the Morley area would appear to have been sporadic and opportunist, placing smaller settlements at risk and tending towards the creation of amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the length of the A650 Bradford to Wakefield road. In my view, the further diffusion of the existing loosely-knit settlement pattern should, as far as possible, be resisted." Considering appeals in 1986 on 81/23/00212 and 81/23/00213 (broadly the same area as LDF sites 3373A/B/C and 1336) the inspector said "It would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This was endorsed in the Secretary of State's decision letter. In 1994, a third inspector dismissed an appeal to develop land at Arthington Close near the edge of Haigh Wood because it would "unacceptably erode the fringe of this rural area and lead to pressure for further encroachment of residential development, particularly in the fields to the west...". Although some years ago these decisions, the character and environment of the area are still semi-rural and just as delicate. When cogent arguments have been repeatedly made against development of the 3373 areas by the Secretary of State, by three planning inspectors and by Leeds Council itself (in evidence to the UDP inquiry), there can be no justification for sites 3373A, 3373C and 1336 being pursued for residential development in the LDF. They should instead be reclassified as "red" and withdrawn from consideration for development when producing the next stage of the plan. 2. Damage to Haigh Wood and Baghill beck valley - Development of this site would be contrary to the Council's policy P12 in the Core Strategy:

Representation ID: REP00646 Question Ref: H2

I DISAGREE WITH SITES 3373A, 3373C and 1336 3. Fairness The Core Strategy seeks to be "fair". The word is used in paragraph 1.2 and again in 1.14. Yet the proposed green housing sites when taken together would definitely not be fair to West Ardsley and Tingley. No justification has been given as to why there is such a concentration here, nor any evidence of local need. Indeed, paragraph 4.6.14 states that "The SHMA 2011 was not able to identify any geographically specific need for new housing based on population growth." The sites seem to have been assessed individually rather than their cumulative impact. This impact is potentially greater when considered alongside Kirklees proposals for Chidswell 4. Highway access - The Upper Green culs-de-sac are not suitable to serve up to 130 more houses. They would become much less safe for children to play in and already severe dangers at school times would be exacerbated. 5. Schools - already full and difficult to expand further. 6. Agricultural- land good quality agricultural land would be lost. 7. Viability - costs from: a. parts of 3373A have serious levels problems and look undevelopable; b. bell pits known to exist in the area from former mining; c. elimination of Japanese Knotweed.

Name: Susan Galvin

Representor No: PRS04623

Representation ID: REP01649 Question Ref: H5

3373a-c as above in h2

Representation ID: REP01649 Question Ref: H9

3373c - proximity to protected wildlife on site 3373b and serious access and highways issues.

Representation ID: REP01649 Question Ref: H11

Irrelevant as site 3373 c should not be developed at all.

Representation ID: REP01649 Question Ref: H2

3373 a-c. Particularly site C at the top of hill top lane, through which access would be fed. This leads off Batley road which is very dangerous already, especially during school start and finish times when traffic is increased. The addition of 144 houses, minimum 2 cars per house, would be hugely detrimental to road safety and heighten risk. In addition capacity of local amenities such as schools to cope is questionable. There has been considerable building of housing in recent years, and still continuing, but no increase in capacity of amenities. Site A has comments regarding wildlife in Haigh wood, and these comments should also apply to site C, particularly bats which fly regularly across site c.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Paul Stevenson

Representor No: PRS04651

Representation ID: REP01188 Question Ref: H1

Land to the west of the Hill Tops is not suitable for development. There is no sensible access, local roads and amenities (like schools and doctors) cannot cope with the needs of additional residents and, most importantly, the area is a well used local green space and amenity which should not be developed.

Representation ID: REP01188 Question Ref: H2

3373A & 3373C

Name: Saphena Hair

Representor No: PRS04827

Representation ID: REP00929 Question Ref: H1

Site at the end of Hill Top Lane WF3 should not be developed further.

Representation ID: REP00929 Question Ref: H2

Field at the top of Hill Top Lane WF3. The village of West Ardsley has had too many new houses built in the recent years. The field at the end of hill top lane has woods which is a nature reserve, there would be an adverse effect on the wildlife. The roads around here are not adequate for more traffic. West Ardsley is a village which is fast disappearing and merging into Tingley.

Name: Andrea Heibel

Representor No: PRS04839

Representation ID: REP00878 Question Ref: G1

Site 3373A objection. The local character and identity of West Ardsley would be seriously threatened by 3373A, especially when combined with sites 3373C and 1336, and would make its component areas of Upper Green, Haigh Moor and Hill Top barely distinguishable from each other. My view accords with three decision letters from the Planning Inspectorate which were used in the Council's own evidence to the Unitary Development Plan public inquiry in 1995. In paragraph 39 of his report on the Morley Local Plan, the inspector considered that the planned development at Haigh Wood (site WA2H) would have a "very serious impact upon the character and environment of West Ardsley". "In the past, development in the Morley area would appear to have been sporadic and opportunist, placing the identity of the smaller settlements at risk and tending towards the creation of amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the length of the A650 Bradford to Wakefield road. In my view, the further diffusion of the existing loosely-knit settlement pattern should, as far as possible, be resisted." In 1994, another inspector dismissed an appeal to develop land at Arthington Close near the edge of Haigh Wood because it would "unacceptably erode the fringe of this rural area and would lead to pressure for further encroachment of residential development, most particularly in the fields to the west...".

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Samantha Halls

Representor No: PRS05085

Representation ID: REP05653 Question Ref: H1

Site 3373A. Objections

1. Local character and identity

Development of this site would be contrary to the following sections of the Council's policy SP1 in the Core Strategy:

1. SP1 (i) states: "Smaller Settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlement's size, function and sustainability."

Site 3373A, with its estimated capacity of 130 dwellings, does not have regard to the size, function and sustainability of West Ardsley.

SP1 (iii) states: "For development to respect and enhance the local character and identity of places and neighbourhoods". The local character and identity of West Ardsley would be seriously threatened by 3373A, especially when combined with sites 3373C and 1336, and would make its component areas of Upper Green, Haigh Moor and Hill Top barely distinguishable from each other.

My view accords with three decision letters from the Planning Inspectorate which were used in the Council's own evidence to the Unitary Development Plan public inquiry in 1995. In paragraph 39 of his report on the Morley Local Plan, the inspector considered that the planned development at Haigh Wood (site WA2H) would have a "very serious impact upon the character and environment of West Ardsley". He concluded in paragraph 10: "In the past, development in the Morley area would appear to have been sporadic and opportunist, placing the identity of the smaller settlements at risk and tending towards the creation of amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the length of the A650 Bradford to Wakefield road. In my view, the further diffusion of the existing loosely-knit settlement pattern should, as far as possible, be resisted." Considering appeals in 1986 on 81/23/00212 and 81/23/00213 (broadly the same area as LDF sites 3373A/B/C and 1336) the inspector said "It would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This was endorsed in the Secretary of State's decision letter.

In 1994, a third inspector dismissed an appeal to develop land at Arthington Close near the the edge of Haigh Wood because it would "unacceptably erode the fringe of this rural area and would lead to pressure for further encroachment of residential development, most particularly in the fields to the west...".

Although some years have passed since these decisions, the character and environment of the area are still semi-rural and just as delicate. When cogent arguments have been repeatedly made against development of the 3373 areas by the Secretary of State, by three planning inspectors and by Leeds Council itself (in evidence to the UDP inquiry), there can be no justification for sites 3373A, 3373C and 1336 being pursued for residential development in the LDF. They should instead be reclassified as "red" and withdrawn from consideration for development when producing the next stage of the plan.

2. Damage to Haigh Wood and Baghill beck valley

Development of this site would be contrary to the Council's policy P12 in the Core Strategy:

"The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes, including their historical and cultural significance, will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness through stewardship and the planning process." The secluded Haigh Wood valley comprises the central portion of site 3373A, including part of the wood covered by a Tree Preservation Order. Residential development would prejudice the objectives underlining this policy as set out in paragraphs 5.3.46 to 5.3.48 of the Core Strategy including: "The Council seeks to protect and enhance the varied landscapes of Leeds and the assets they contain, from valued local trees, the countryside to nationally designated landscape, fauna and flora".

This view was endorsed by three planning inspectors and again in the Council's evidence, given by Mr G B Andrews, at the UDP inquiry. In his paragraph 4.3.6, Mr Andrews stated: I refer to the conclusions reached by the inspectors at the two subsequent appeal cases in 1985 and 1994. In each case it is acknowledged that the Haigh Wood area is of value as an area of attractive open farmland with a rural character and provides an important amenity in the local area". Even the Council's own assessment for the LDF states that the site is: "Not supported (RED). This site includes Haigh Wood and Baghill Beck Local Nature Area which fall under UK Biological Action Plan priority habitats - a mixture of woodland, scrub and grassland habitats alongside Baghill Beck. There are a number of wide hedgerow/woodland belts throughout the site that provide a valuable habitat. Water vole has been recorded on the Hey Beck. The Baghill Beck flows into this water course and could support this species. Bats to consider."

3. Fairness

The Core Strategy seeks to be "fair". The word is used in paragraph 1.2 and again in 1.14. Yet the proposed green housing sites when taken together would definitely not be fair to West Ardsley and Tingley. No justification has been given as to why there is such a concentration here, nor any evidence of local need. Indeed, paragraph 4.6.14 states that "The SHMA 2011 was not able to identify any geographically specific need for new housing based on population growth." The sites seem to have been assessed individually rather than their cumulative impact. This impact is potentially very much greater when considered alongside Kirklees Council's proposals for the Chidswell area.

4. Highway access

The Upper Green culs-de-sac are not suitable to serve up to 130 more houses. They would become much less safe for children to play in and the already severe dangers at school times would be exacerbated.

5. Schools

Primary and secondary schools already full and difficult to expand further.

6. Agricultural land

Good quality agricultural land would be lost.

7. Viability

Extra costs from: a. parts of 3373A have serious levels problems and look undevelopable; b. bell pits known to exist in the area from former mining; c. elimination of Japanese Knotweed.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Helen Fawcett

Representor No: PRS05088

Representation ID: REP05663 Question Ref: H4

we wish to register our protest as to the proposed building of New houses at the fields at the end of Hill Top Lane, Tingley WF3 1HT.
the reasons are -- 1 destruction of woodland, wild -life habitat.
2 increased traffic a danger to residents, especially to children
3 access from Batley Road would be dangerous , due to bad bend in Batley road
4 near to school, increased traffic a danger for school children
5 parking on road a problem now for school attenders, would be worse if road upgraded

Name: Geoffrey Barker

Representor No: PRS05093

Representation ID: REP05661 Question Ref: H1

we wish to register our protest as to the proposed building of New houses at the fields at the end of Hill Top Lane, Tingley WF3 1HT.
the reasons are -- 1 destruction of woodland, wild -life habitat.
2 increased traffic a danger to residents, especially to children
3 access from Batley Road would be dangerous , due to bad bend in Batley road
4 near to school, increased traffic a danger for school children
5 parking on road a problem now for school attenders, would be worse if road upgraded

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Andrea Heibel

Representor No: PRS05109

Representation ID: REP05689 Question Ref: H1

Please note my objections to the proposed developments below.
The proposal for site 3373A (This is the site that runs from the top of Baghill around the back of Arthington Close and Upper Green and will finish on Westerton Road opposite Lonsdale Rise) is to build 130 houses. Lee gap Fair is held twice a year in these fields, the fair is the oldest horse fair in England dating back to 1136 and forms part of the history and heritage of the area.
The 3373C site which will run from the top of Hilltop Lane and carve up all the fields from there to Nook Green on Haigh Moor Road is for 144 houses. It can be argued that the highways infrastructure for Site 3373B is inadequate, there are Highways concerns re poor accessibility for the number of houses proposed and then there is the issue of Highways safety with the junction of Hilltop Lane being within 100 metres of the primary school. All the issues on the attached letter are also relevant for site 3373C.
The site on Westerton Road from Regency Gardens to Westerton Wood if developed will see 117 new homes - this land is currently classed as green belt (site 3365 = 83 homes and site 1258 = 34 homes) development here will represent a major incursion into the Green belt and will create further pressure on Ardsley reservoir as a local beauty spot.
Development of sites 3365 and 1258 will result in the loss of valuable agricultural land, there are a number of wide hedgerow and woodland belts throughout the site that provide a valuable habitat for wildlife in particular bats.
Development of the sites on Westerton Road will result in the amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the whole length of the Westerton Road.
Site 1330B is an extension of the building that is currently ongoing adjacent to Jude's pond - and is for a further 32 houses ! This site has major highways access issues and has less than the recommended visibility splay for highways safety - further development of this site will exasperate current problems regarding drainage on the land - Haigh Moor Road residents already have to deal with flooding of the pavements and highways in the vicinity of Jude's pond.
Please note that all these sites are in addition to any planning applications that have already been approved.
464 houses in such a small vicinity is unsustainable, there are currently just over 300 pupils at Hill Top Primary School with no room for any expansion, the school is full and the same is true of Westerton which as you know was a small village school 20 years ago but is now one of the biggest primary schools in the Leeds district and all because of the amount of building that has taken place over recent years.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Andrea Heibel

Representor No: PRS05109

Leeds City Council have in their allocation plan confirmed that Ardsley and Robin Hood have a deficiency in parks and gardens (the only area in Leeds South West to be deficient) - our children already have very little designated play areas, they have also confirmed that we are deficient in outdoor sports areas and facilities for children to play. We have however got a surplus of natural green space which is currently under threat of housing - if this natural greenspace is to be used for any purpose, surely it should be used to reduce the deficit and improve our community. Further reduction of amenity greenspace in an area which is seeing more and more housing development is unfair and unsustainable. Our GP surgeries are at breaking point with current waiting times for appointments being in excess of two weeks, the surgery at Leigh View was recently extended and it's difficult to envisage how this could be extended further to serve the population boom that will ensue if all these sites are developed. Further erosion of the demarcation between West Ardsley & Tingley - soon the two settlements will merge into one and West Ardsley as a separate community will be subsumed into its near neighbour, the two areas will be barely distinguishable from each other which is contrary to the Councils policy SP1 which clearly states smaller Settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlement's size, function and sustainability. If these plans were approved it will no doubt result in urban sprawl with no identifiable boundaries. Our fields provide a public amenity for dog-walkers, cyclists, ramblers and local residents alike and It would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This view was endorsed by the Secretary of State in their past decision letter. Our road network was not built to support the existing volume of traffic , we do not have the infrastructure to support development of this scale, our public transport links are very poor with only one bus an hour into Leeds, the only viable means of transportation is by car which will have a cumulative impact on the A650 and A653 which are already congested. I look forward to your response and confirmation that these developments will not go ahead

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Lynsey Morris

Representor No: PRS05111

Representation ID: REP05692 Question Ref: H1

Hi,

I would like to object against the planning proposals for the following sites on Map 33 (off Westerton Road)

1336

3373B

3373A

1330B

33732

3365

3373C

3456A

3456B

1258

I suggest that these should all be changed to RED due to the following reasons:

Too much traffic already so roads will be extremely busy right outside my front door. I have young children and will be scared for their safety.

Services such as Doctors surgery's, dentists, local hospitals, schools, supermarkets already too busy so won't be able to cope

Less water will be absorbed into the ground resulting in more flooding in our gardens.

This is currently already happening in several houses on Westerton Road including mine.

There are bats, foxes, owls, frogs, newts and many birds living in the area especially on sites 1336, 3373A, 3373B, 3373C. Should these not be protected?

House prices for homeowners in the area already will decrease.

We moved to the area because of the greenery and our view will be spoilt.

The sewerage system in place on Westerton Road recently failed causing waste from the sewers to overflow into nearby houses. This was due to the recent housing developments that have recently been built nearby so the sewerage system was unable to cope. This could very likely happen again.

Name: D, M, S Johnson And Kenny

Representor No: PRS05119

Representation ID: REP05702 Question Ref: General comment

Firstly I would like to express my disappointment and embarrassment towards the councils plans for the proposed plans listed below. I understand the reason behind the lack of communication with the residents in the area may be beneficial to the local council and certain government groups. It obviously cuts down on man hours and paperwork.

I would like to object against the planning proposals for the following sites on Map 33 (off Westerton Road)

1336

3373B

3373A

1330B

33732

3365

3373C

3456A

3456B

1258

The infrastructure in this area will struggle to cope with the demands of the services required.

The area is attracting wildlife not seen in built up areas. It seems a shame to disregard the wildlife issue I'm sure if a full environmental survey of the area was to be carried out this would scupper the planning permission. But again that would be an extra cost to the council which would have an impact at year end when the books are balanced.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Ian Morris

Representor No: PRS05121

Representation ID: REP05700 Question Ref: H1

Firstly I would like to express my disappointment and embarrassment towards the councils plans for the proposed plans listed below. I understand the reason behind the lack of communication with the residents in the area may be beneficial to the local council and certain government groups. It obviously cuts down on man hours and paperwork.

I would like to object against the planning proposals for the following sites on Map 33 (off Westerton Road)

1336
3373B
3373A
1330B
33732
3365
3373C
3456A
3456B
1258

The infrastructure in this area will struggle to cope with the demands of the services required. The area is attracting wildlife not seen in built up areas. It seems a shame to disregard the wildlife issue I'm sure if a full environmental survey of the area was to be carried out this would scupper the planning permission. But again that would be an extra cost to the council which would have an impact at year end when the books are balanced.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Eric Mearis

Representor No: PRS05165

Representation ID: REP05748 Question Ref: H1

I wish to object to the above sites on the following basis

Site 3373A and 3373C Objections

1. Local character and identity

Development of these sites would be contrary to the following

sections of the Council's policy SP1 in the Core Strategy:

1. SP1 (i) states: "Smaller Settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlement's size, function and sustainability."

Sites 3373A and 3373C with their estimated capacity of 277 dwellings, does not have regard to the size, function and sustainability of West Ardsley.

SP1 (iii) states: "For development to respect and enhance the local character and identity of places and neighbourhoods". The local character and identity of West Ardsley would be seriously threatened especially when combined with sites 3373A, 3373C and 1336, and would make its component areas of Upper Green, Haigh Moor and Hill Top barely distinguishable from each other.

My view accords with three decision letters from the Planning Inspectorate which were used in the Council's own evidence to the Unitary Development Plan public inquiry in 1995. In paragraph 39 of his report on the Morley Local Plan, the inspector considered that the planned development at Haigh Wood (site WA2H) would have a "very serious impact upon the character and environment of West Ardsley". He concluded in paragraph 10: "In the past, development in the Morley area would appear to have been sporadic and opportunistic, placing the identity of the smaller settlements at risk and tending towards the creation of amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the length of the A650 Bradford to Wakefield road. In my view, the further diffusion of the existing loosely-knit settlement pattern should, as far as possible, be resisted."

Considering appeals in 1986 on 81/23/00212 and 81/23/00213 (broadly the same area as LDF sites 3373A/B/C and 1336) the inspector said "It would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This was endorsed in the Secretary of State's decision letter.

In 1994, a third inspector dismissed an appeal to develop land at Arthington Close near the edge of Haigh Wood because it would "unacceptably erode the fringe of this rural area and would lead to pressure for further encroachment of residential development, most particularly in the fields to the west."

Although some years have passed since these decisions, the character and environment of the area are still semi-rural and just as delicate. When cogent arguments have been repeatedly made against development of the 3373 areas by the Secretary of State, by three planning inspectors and by Leeds Council itself (in evidence to the UDP inquiry), there can be no justification for sites 3373A, 3373C and 1336 being pursued for residential development in the LDF. They should instead be reclassified as "red" and withdrawn from consideration for development when producing the next stage of the plan.

2. Damage to Haigh Wood and Baghill beck valley

Development of this site would be contrary to the Council's policy

P12 in the Core Strategy:

"The character, quality and biodiversity of Leeds' townscapes and landscapes, including their historical and cultural significance, will be conserved and enhanced to protect their distinctiveness through stewardship and the planning process." The secluded Haigh Wood valley comprises the central portion of site 3373A, including part of the wood covered by a Tree Preservation Order. Residential development would prejudice the objectives underlining this policy as set out in paragraphs 5.3.46 to 5.3.48 of the Core Strategy including: "The Council seeks to protect and enhance the varied landscapes of Leeds and the assets they contain, from valued local trees, the countryside to nationally designated landscape, fauna and flora". This view was endorsed by three planning inspectors and again in the Council's evidence, given by Mr G B Andrews, at the UDP inquiry. In his paragraph 4.3.6, Mr Andrews stated: I refer to the conclusions reached by the inspectors at the two subsequent appeal cases in 1985 and 1994. In each case it is acknowledged that the Haigh Wood area is of value as an area of attractive open farmland with a rural character and provides an important amenity in the local area". Even the Council's own assessment for the LDF states that the site is: "Not supported (RED). This site includes Haigh Wood and Baghill Beck Local Nature Area which fall under UK Biological Action Plan priority habitats - a mixture of woodland, scrub and grassland habitats alongside Baghill Beck. There are a number of wide hedgerow/woodland belts

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Eric Mearis

Representor No: PRS05165

throughout the site that provide a valuable habitat. Water vole has been recorded on the Hey Beck. The Baghill Beck flows into this water course and could support this species. Bats to consider."

3. Fairness

The Core Strategy seeks to be "fair". The word is used in paragraph 1.2 and again in 1.14. Yet the proposed green housing sites when taken together would definitely not be fair to West Ardsley and Tingley. No justification has been given as to why there is such a concentration here, nor any evidence of local need. Indeed, paragraph 4.6.14 states that "The SHMA 2011 was not able to identify any geographically specific need for new housing based on population growth." The sites seem to have been assessed individually rather than their cumulative impact. This impact is potentially very much greater when considered alongside Kirklees Council's proposals for the Chidswell area.

4. Highway access

The Upper Green culs-de-sac and Hill Top Lane cul-de-sacs are not suitable to serve up to 274 more houses. They would become much less safe for children to play in and the already severe dangers at school times would be exacerbated. Both cul-de-sacs are within 100 metres of primary schools

5. Schools

Primary and secondary schools already full and difficult to expand further.

6. Agricultural land

Good quality agricultural land would be lost.

7. Viability

Extra costs from: a. parts of 3373A have serious levels problems and look undevelopable; b. bell pits known to exist in the area from former mining; c. elimination of Japanese Knotweed.

OTHER POINTS TO BE RAISED

Site 3373A Lee gap Fair is held twice a year in these fields, the fair is the oldest horse fair in England dating back to 1136 and forms part of the history and heritage of the area.

The 3373C site the highways infrastructure for Site 3373C is inadequate, there are Highways concerns re poor accessibility for the number of houses proposed and then there is the issue of Highways safety with the junction of Hilltop Lane being within 100 metres of the primary school

The site on Westerton Road from Regency Gardens to Westerton Wood this land is currently classed as green belt (site 3365 = 83 homes and site 1258 = 34 homes) development here will represent a major incursion into the Green belt and will create further pressure on Ardsley reservoir as a local beauty spot. Development of sites 3365 and 1258 will result in the loss of valuable agricultural land, there are a number of wide hedgerow and woodland belts throughout the site that provide a valuable habitat for wildlife in particular bats. Development of the sites on Westerton Road will result in the amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the whole length of the Westerton Road.

Site 1330B is an extension of the building that is currently ongoing adjacent to Jude's pond - and is for a further 32 houses ! This site has major highways access issues and has less than the recommended visibility splay for highways safety - further development of this site will exasperate current problems regarding drainage on the land - Haigh Moor Road residents already have to deal with flooding of the pavements and highways in the vicinity of Jude's pond.

464 houses in such a small vicinity is unsustainable, there are currently just over 300 pupils at Hill Top Primary School with no room for any expansion, the school is full and the same is true of Westerton which as you know was a small village school 20 years ago but is now one of the biggest primary schools in the Leeds district and all because of the amount of building that has taken place over recent years.

Leeds City Council have in their allocation plan confirmed that Ardsley and Robin Hood have a deficiency in parks and gardens (the only area in Leeds South West to be deficient) - our children already have very little designated play areas, they have also confirmed that we are deficient in outdoor sports areas and facilities for children to play. We have however got a surplus of natural green space which is currently under threat of housing - if this natural greenspace is to be used for any purpose, surely it should be used to reduce the deficit and improve our community. Further reduction of amenity greenspace in an area which is seeing more and more housing development is unfair and unsustainable.

Our GP surgeries are at breaking point with current waiting times for appointments being in excess of two weeks, the surgery at Leigh View was recently extended and it's difficult to envisage how this could be extended further to serve the population boom that will ensue if all these sites are

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Eric Mearis

Representor No: PRS05165

developed.

Further erosion of the demarcation between West Ardsley & Tingley - soon the two settlements will merge into one and West Ardsley as a separate community will be subsumed into its near neighbour, the two areas will be barely distinguishable from each other which is contrary to the Councils policy SP1 which clearly states smaller Settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlement's size, function and sustainability. If these plans were approved it will no doubt result in urban sprawl with no identifiable boundaries.

Our fields provide a public amenity for dog-walkers, cyclists, ramblers and local residents alike and It would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This view was endorsed by the Secretary of State in their past decision letter.

Our road network was not built to support the existing volume of traffic , we do not have the infrastructure to support development of this scale, our public transport links are very poor with only one bus an hour into Leeds, the only viable means of transportation is by car which will have a cumulative impact on the A650 and A653 which are already congested

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Stephen Cowling

Representor No: PRS05177

Representation ID: REP05759 Question Ref: H1

I wish to object to 3373A, 3373B & 3373C.

[x]

I wish to object on the following grounds:

. The Haigh Wood site reference is 3373, and it is split into 3 parts:

. 3373A is land between Westerton Road & Haigh Wood. This has been assessed as suitable for residential development, with a capacity of 130 houses.

. 3373B is Haigh Wood itself. This has been assessed as unsuitable for residential development because of the topography of the site and access

. 3373C is the fields between Haigh Wood & Woollin Crescent, linking right round to Nook Farm.

The proposal for site 3373A (This is the site that runs from the top of Baghill around the back of Arthington Close and Upper Green and will finish on Westerton Road opposite Lonsdale Rise) is to build 130 houses. Lee gap Fair is held twice a year in these fields, the fair is the oldest horse fair in England dating back to 1136 and forms part of the history and heritage of the area.

The 3373C site which will run from the top of Hilltop Lane and carve up all the fields from there to Nook Green on Haigh Moor Road is for 144 houses. It can be argued that the highways infrastructure for Site 3373B is inadequate, there are Highways concerns re poor accessibility for the number of houses proposed and then there is the issue of Highways safety with the junction of Hilltop Lane being within 100 metres of the primary school. All the issues on the attached letter are also relevant for site 3373C.

The site on Westerton Road from Regency Gardens to Westerton Wood if developed will see 117 new homes - this land is currently classed as green belt (site 3365 = 83 homes and site 1258 = 34 homes) development here will represent a major incursion into the Green belt and will create further pressure on Ardsley reservoir as a local beauty spot. Development of sites 3365 and 1258 will result in the loss of valuable agricultural land, there are a number of wide hedgerow and woodland belts throughout the site that provide a valuable habitat for wildlife in particular bats. Development of the sites on Westerton Road will result in the amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the whole length of the Westerton Road. Site 1330B is an extension of the building that is currently ongoing adjacent to Jude's pond - and is for a further 32 houses ! This site has major highways access issues and has less than the recommended visibility splay for highways safety - further development of this site will exasperate current problems regarding drainage on the land - Haigh Moor Road residents already have to deal with flooding of the pavements and highways in the vicinity of Jude's pond.

Please note that all these sites are in addition to any planning applications that have already been approved.

464 houses in such a small vicinity is unsustainable, there are currently just over 300 pupils at Hill Top Primary School with no room for any expansion, the school is full and the same is true of Westerton which as you know was a small village school 20 years ago but is now one of the biggest primary schools in the Leeds district and all because of the amount of building that has taken place over recent years.

Leeds City Council have in their allocation plan confirmed that Ardsley and Robin Hood have a deficiency in parks and gardens (the only area in Leeds South West to be deficient) - our children already have very little designated play areas, they have also confirmed that we are deficient in outdoor sports areas and facilities for children to play. We have however got a surplus of natural green space which is currently under threat of housing - if this natural greenspace is to be used for any purpose, surely it should be used to reduce the deficit and improve our community. Further reduction of amenity greenspace in an area which is seeing more and more housing development is unfair and unsustainable.

Our GP surgeries are at breaking point with current waiting times for appointments being in excess of two weeks, the surgery at Leigh View was recently extended and it's difficult to envisage how this could be extended further to serve the population boom that will ensue if all these sites are developed.

Further erosion of the demarcation between West Ardsley & Tingley - soon the two settlements will merge into one and West Ardsley as a separate community will be subsumed into its near neighbour, the two areas will be barely distinguishable from each other which is contrary to the Councils policy SP1 which clearly states smaller Settlements will contribute to development needs, with the scale of growth having regard to the settlement's size, function and sustainability. If these plans were approved it will no doubt

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Stephen Cowling

Representor No: PRS05177

result in urban sprawl with no identifiable boundaries.

Our fields provide a public amenity for dog-walkers, cyclists, ramblers and local residents alike and It would virtually eliminate the open centre and consolidate the semi-rural group of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area". This view was endorsed by the Secretary of State in their past decision letter.

Our road network was not built to support the existing volume of traffic , we do not have the infrastructure to support development of this scale, our public transport links are very poor with only one bus an hour into Leeds, the only viable means of transportation is by car which will have a cumulative impact on the A650 and A653 which are already congested I trust that this is in order.

Regards

[x]

Name: Brian Judge

Representor No: PRS05411

Representation ID: REP06013 Question Ref: H1

3373c – Suggested change GREEN to AMBER

Reason for change - Again spoiling the natural beauty of the wood which is enjoyed by everyone and would also affect wildlife.

Other remarks - Would impact on traffic schools and of practises. Volumes of traffic have increased tremendously in recent years with all types of vehicles coming from Wakefield via Kirkhamgate, Over Hill Top and up Bashill Road on their way to Bradford Leeds etc.

Name: Lisa Mulherin

Representor No: PRS05734

Representation ID: REP07126 Question Ref: H1

3373A and C either side of Haigh Wood – 274houses across these sites are unsustainable. There is a significant lack of school places. Both Hilltop and Westerton Primary are full. Hilltop is a tightly constrained PFI site and it is hard to see how it could be expanded. Westerton is already 3 form entry. Public transport links are terrible. For those reliant on public transport it is a two hour round trip to the GPs on Bradford Road. Open views across Haigh Wood would inevitably be damaged (a feature that a previous planning inspector was keen to maintain. Access to site 3373C would be potentially dangerous exiting on to Batley Road at the brow of the hill near Hilltop Primary. These Green Belt sites should be re-designated Red.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Neil Dawson

Representor No: PRS05884

Representation ID: REP06563 Question Ref: H1

Suggested sites from Green to Red;

1029
1072
1143B
1143D
1200A
1258
1344
3365
3373A
3373C
3456A

All of the above sites are in the current Green Belt with the exception of the 3373A and 3373C which are open land.

The other sites are all located within the existing Green Belt and any development would lead to increased urban sprawl between the various townships in the Outer South West, and lead to coalescence between communities.

Development of the Green Belt sites would also reduce the open green area between settlements and create encroachment into the countryside around Morley.

In addition there is insufficient road capacity in the area particularly the very busy single carriageway A650 from East Ardsley to Tingley. Even if there is no development of the above sites there is in the allocation plan over 1,200 additional new houses close to the A650 which will put additional strain on this busy road.

The Haigh Moor sites are part of a natural valley which is popular for recreational activities. The whole site is considered best treated as one, therefore if the largest part 3373B is not to be used for housing then the other parts of the site should be treated in a similar manner. This should be retained as open green space.

Site 1072 is in the Green Belt and although there are properties adjacent it is located near to the A653 and shares similar characteristics to site 3078B which is not considered suitable for development. A development at this site would set a precedent for incursion into the Green Belt between Leeds and Kirklees.

See rep for full details.

Name: Karen Williams

Representor No: PRS06027

Representation ID: REP06857 Question Ref: H1

Sites 3373A & 3373C, Green to Red (assumed)

I believe the areas in question are the only green areas left in the area for children to play, people to walk their dogs etc, Tingley is already overcrowded with schools so much so that local children are having to travel to schools further away. This is the last of the green belt area left in tingley/ardsley. We already have too much traffic for such a built up area.

Name: Karen Renshaw

Representor No: PRS06048

Representation ID: REP06876 Question Ref: H1

3373A & 3373C Haigh Wood, West Ardsley – total of 274 properties. This is unacceptable and the area could not facilitate and/or accommodate this number of properties.. Local children have no places within their schools already and it's also a 2 hour journey to access the Dr's surgery for these local residents. The bus and transport service is inadequate and would need to be addressed as well as roads not created to take the amount of traffic which would be using the highways, endangering local residents and young people on school journeys. This area would lose its character and identity by developments merging different localities into one blur – villages and area gone forever.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: West Ardsley Consortium

Representor No: PRS06168

Representation ID: REP06984 Question Ref: H1

Allocations Issues and Options Document- Sites 536 (Nook Farm) , 1330 B (Adjacent to Judes Pond), 1336 (Westerton Road, and 3373 A, Band C (Haigh Wood)

We act on behalf of the West Ardsley Consortium that has made formal comments to the Leeds Site Allocations Issues and Options documents. We enclose a copy of the Document submitted with the formal response for your information.

Our clients are interested in sites 536 (Nook Farm) , 1330 8 (Adjacent to Judes Pond), 1336 (Westerton Road, and 3373 A, 8 and C (Haigh Wood) and have previously made representations for the sites to be allocated, along with a substantial area of ecologically maintained open space centred around the Haigh Wood area.

Having seen the draft proposals our clients are supportive in principle of the Councils approach to identifying a large portion of the land promoted by them for residential development. The areas identified as "Green" (for development) in the Issues and Options document at Haigh Wood amount to 16.83 Ha of land with a suggested dwelling capacity of over 400 units (at a reasonably low 25/Ha). The areas identified as "Red" (felt to be not suitable for development) amount to 17.5 Ha. This sets an approach of slightly over half the land being protected from development.

We note that the site known as Nook Farm (536) is an existing UDPR commitment and has no policy designation that has or would suggest anything other than its suitability for residential development. That site also has (contrary to the suggestion in the Issues and Options document) an extant planning permission. The details of this are set out in our formal representations.

I have reviewed the indicative boundaries suggested between the "Green" and "Red" sites in the Issues and Options document and undertaken a detailed assessment against trees, topography, the LNA of Haigh Wood and the stream running through it, whilst acknowledging the need for an uninterrupted green corridor separating the north west and south east areas of land, our clients are firmly of the view that the Councils preliminary work does not produce appropriate boundaries between development allocations and non development allocations. For example as figure 3 in the attached document shows land is identified by the Council for development in site 33 73A that includes part of the LNA, the trees of Haigh Wood and the stream running through it, whilst seeking to protect from development land to the south east which has none of those considerations applying to it.

Utilising the work already done on ecology, trees and hedges, landscape and topography, our Clients have carefully considered the Councils objectives and aspirations from the comments in the tables and proposals associated with the Issues and Options document. They have produced a revised masterplan and from that been able to identify appropriate development and allocation boundaries. These maintain a broad green corridor through the valley, protecting ecological interests, trees and the stream as well as views and the "open feel" of the valley itself. In particular this has not only widened the broad swathe of green between the development areas, compared to the earlier 2012 masterplan, but removed any road connections across the valley.

The resultant masterplan has been informed by all the Consortium team's professional disciplines and the changed highways connections fully evaluated to ensure they work appropriately.

The outcome is that of the area in the UDPR that is identified as N 11 (some 36.14 Ha) only 40% is now proposed for development. The suggested allocations (boundaries shown in red on Figure 6 of the attached document include (so that the allocations are not excessively subdivided) substantial green corridors and strategic planting, amounting to some 3.241ha. These run along the existing and proposed pedestrian and bridleway access corridors to the valley and the Wood. The suggested total area of the allocations (including the 3.24 Ha of undeveloped green space) is under half of the current N 11 land at 17.66 Ha. We believe this provides the right balance of development and protection of the wider site.

We note that the areas identified as "Green" in the Issues and Options document in this Outer South West area are insufficient by some margin (1,432) to meet the Core Strategy suggested proportion of housing for the area, even taking into account (and not questioning) the amount of development to come forward from permissions and existing allocations. There should be no doubt that all "Green" sites should therefore go forward for allocation. Indeed more will need to be found from "Amber" or even "Red" sites to provide sufficient land. In addition, there are proportionately far fewer "Green" sites (compared to "Amber") in East and West Ardsley than there are in Morley or the rest of the Outer South West.

The site at Haigh Wood with its non greenbelt status and accessibility and sustainability credentials provides a very good location for development and the provision of material environmental benefits through protection, increased access and environmental management of the Wood itself. As there have to be exceptional circumstances to take land out of the greenbelt, there must correspondingly be exceptional circumstances not to develop at Haigh Wood ahead of greenbelt land.

For all of these reasons our clients, look forward to working with the Council to bring forward development in line with the attached revised masterplan, which we believe fully addresses all comments made in the Issues and Options document and the related concerns about the land at Haigh Wood.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: West Ardsley Consortium

Representor No: PRS06168

Representation ID: REP07292 Question Ref: H7

Dear Madam

Allocations Issues and Options Document - Sites 536 (Nook Farm) , 1330 B (Adjacent to Judes Pond), 1336 (Westerton Road, and 3373 A, B and C (Haigh Wood)

We act on behalf of the West Ardsley Consortium that has made formal comments to the Leeds Site Allocations Issues and Options documents. We enclose a copy of the Document submitted with the formal response for your information.

Our clients are interested in sites 536 (Nook Farm) , 1330 B (Adjacent to Judes Pond), 1336 (Westerton Road, and 3373 A, B and C (Haigh Wood) and have previously made representations for the sites to be allocated, along with a substantial area of ecologically maintained open space centred around the Haigh Wood area.

Having seen the draft proposals our clients are supportive in principle of the Councils approach to identifying a large portion of the land promoted by them for residential development. The areas identified as "Green" (for development) in the Issues and Options document at Haigh Wood amount to 16.83 Ha of land with a suggested dwelling capacity of over 400 units (at a reasonably low 25/Ha). The areas identified as "Red" (felt to be not suitable for development) amount to 17.5 Ha. This sets an approach of slightly over half the land being protected from development.

We note that the site known as Nook Farm (536) is an existing UDPR commitment and has no policy designation that has or would suggest anything other than its suitability for residential development. That site also has (contrary to the suggestion in the Issues and Options document) an extant planning permission. The details of this are set out in our formal representations.

Having reviewed the indicative boundaries suggested between the "Green" and "Red" sites in the Issues and Options document and undertaken a detailed assessment against trees, topography, the LNA of Haigh Wood and the stream running through it, whilst acknowledging the need for an uninterrupted green corridor separating the north west and south east areas of land, our clients are firmly of the view that the Councils preliminary work does not produce appropriate boundaries between development allocations and non development allocations. For example as figure 3 in the attached document shows land is identified by the Council for development in site 3373A that includes part of the LNA, the trees of Haigh Wood and the stream running through it, whilst seeking to protect from development land to the south east which has none of those considerations applying to it.

Utilising the work already done on ecology, trees and hedges, landscape and topography, our Clients have carefully considered the Councils objectives and aspirations from the comments in the tables and pro formas associated with the Issues and Options document. They have produced a revised masterplan and from that been able to identify appropriate development and allocation boundaries. These maintain a broad green corridor through the valley, protecting ecological interests, trees and the stream as well as views and the "open feel" of the valley itself. In particular this has not only widened the broad swathe of green between the development areas, compared to the earlier 2012 masterplan, but removed any road connections across the valley.

The resultant masterplan has been informed by all the Consortium team's professional disciplines and the changed highways connections fully evaluated to ensure they work appropriately.

The outcome is that of the area in the UDPR that is identified as NI 1 (some 36.14 Ha) only 40% is now proposed for development. The suggested allocations (boundaries shown in red on Figure 6 of the attached document include (so that the allocations are not excessively subdivided) substantial green corridors and strategic planting, amounting to some 3.24Ha. These run along the existing and proposed pedestrian and bridleway access corridors to the valley and the Wood. The suggested total area of the allocations (including the 3.24 Ha of undeveloped green space) is under half of the current NI1 land at 17.66 Ha. We believe this provides the right balance of development and protection of the wider site.

We note that the areas identified as "Green" in the Issues and Options document in this Outer South West area are insufficient by some margin (1,432) to meet the Core Strategy suggested proportion of housing for the area, even taking into account (and not questioning) the amount of development to come forward from permissions and existing allocations. There should be no doubt that all "Green" sites should therefore go forward for allocation. Indeed more will need to be found from "Amber" or even "Red" sites to provide sufficient land. In addition, there are proportionately far fewer "Green" sites (compared to "Amber") in East and West Ardsley than there are in Morley or the rest of the Outer South West.

The site at Haigh Wood with its non greenbelt status and accessibility and sustainability credentials provides a very good location for development and the provision of material environmental benefits through protection, increased access and environmental management of the Wood itself. As there have to be exceptional circumstances to take land out of the greenbelt, there must correspondingly be exceptional circumstances not to develop at Haigh Wood ahead of greenbelt land.

For all of these reasons our clients, look forward to working with the Council to bring forward development in line with the attached revised masterplan, which we believe fully addresses all comments made in the Issues and Options document and the related proformas about the land at Haigh Wood.

Yours faithfully

[x]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Gillian, Paul, Sophie And George Carrigill

Representor No: PRS06230

Representation ID: REP07138 Question Ref: H1

No site ref given - assume sites 3373A, B, C

I would like to object to the land at the top of Hill top Lane West Ardsley being allocated for housing, My main concern is the junction coming out of Hill top Lane onto Batley road which already is a hazard, it is a T junction with houses directly facing the end of Hill Top Lane, and the residents park their cars directly in front of their properties. this makes the narrow road even narrower, cars coming up Haybeck lane have a blind corner and some come at terrific speed, there are children crossing at school times and I have witnessed many near misses. Speed cameras, sleeping policemen and SLOW DOWN signs are needed already to prevent the inevitable happening. People Park on Hill Top Lane to drop children off at Hill Top School and Pick up, on both sides of the road, this causes access problems for residents.

The school is only 200 yards from the end of Hill Top Lane. Hill Top School is full to capacity, so unless the buildings are for elderly residents where would the children go to school? Our Local Doctors already have 17,000 patients and are not increasing the number of GP's, I know this as I work within the practice. Children play on Hill top lane on bikes and skate boards, and increased traffic would put a stop to that, it's quiet and safe at present, childrens freedom to play outside their homes in safety has to be considered.

The natural habitat enjoyed by birds, wildlife, walkers, dog walkers and children playing in Haigh Moor woods would be destroyed. The noise, dirt, and heavy plant traffic during development would have a massive affect on residents, especially the elderly who live in the bungalows on the left hand side. who ever has brain stormed this idea wants to come and spend an hour at the bottom of Hill Top lane one school morning and witness the chaos and danger there, we as residents are already inconvenienced greatly by the increased traffic since the School was built.

Name: JI Dixon-parker

Representor No: PRS06245

Representation ID: REP07156 Question Ref: H1

Access to site 3373C might be slightly less problematic via Batley Road and Hill Top but again there is a primary school in the immediate vicinity and the same points will apply.

The recent developments on Westerton Road and Haigh Moor Road have already increased road usage of Westerton Road significantly putting the large number of school children using this road at greater risk.

Representation ID: REP07156 Question Ref: H1

ocal Amenities and Infrastructure.

The inclusion of the sites above when combined with the building which has already taken place and those sites where planning permission has already been granted would result in an unacceptable level of over intensification and have a disastrous impact on local GP surgeries and schools in the immediate area. There is only one GP Practice serving the area and it is oversubscribed with waiting time for an appointment currently running at 3 weeks. This is already unacceptable based on the current number of houses in the area. There is one dental practice with no vacancies for new patients and all local schools are oversubscribed with local children already unable to attend their local schools. The addition of more houses would only cause further problems.

Representation ID: REP07156 Question Ref: H1

The proposed site at 3373A is the site used for the bi-annual gypsy, Roma and traveller horse fair- Lee Gap Fair. This is the oldest horse fair in the country granted under Royal Charter by King Stephen in 1136- so now being in its 877th year. Insufficient consideration has been given to the impact of these proposals on this important part of gypsy, Roma and traveller heritage and it would be completely unacceptable to take away the ability for the travellers from all over the UK and beyond to meet on this land and particularly so when Leeds City Council themselves have taken a keen interest in the fair and the welfare of the travellers who attend.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3373C

Housing

Haigh Wood, Ardsley

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 1 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if these sites would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. Significant developer contributions will be required at these sites to improve the public transport to meet the council LDF accessibility policies; particularly in the larger sites should these be brought forward for development. These include SHLAA ref: 2062, 1032, 1046, 1017 & 1055.

Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small sites low capacity are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

The table also includes accessibility assessments results to access other services and facilities within acceptable journey times on public transport.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H1

Disagree with Council's green assessment, think the site should be red

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H1

Disagree with Council's green assessment, think the site should be red

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3378

Housing

Geldered Road, Leeds

Name: Brian Guy

Representor No: PRS00142

Representation ID: REP04659 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Wenda P Whitehead

Representor No: PRS00312

Representation ID: REP04786 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: David Sykes

Representor No: PRS00347

Representation ID: REP02290 Question Ref: H1

3378 - Green to red.

Name: S Leeman

Representor No: PRS00366

Representation ID: REP02292 Question Ref: H1

Gildersome Parish Council would like to comment on the above Leeds LDF as follows:
Regarding proposed residential developments sites 200A (assumed 1200A) Land off Highfield Drive and 3378 Land off Wakefield Road/Street Lane - as both these are in and around Gildersome, we feel that in this area the volume of traffic and the extra pollution, noise and overloading of the infrastructure would change Gildersome and the surrounding area to an unrecognisable place for our local community to live.
Our schools and doctors are over subscribed. We would be left with very little green spaces for people to enjoy close to where they live.
Gildersome Parish Council are already, along with many other members of the local community, opposing a proposed large industrial/warehouse site on Gilderd Road/Asquith Avenue, Ref. 2303010. This area should be allowed to revert back to green belt as it acts as a buffer between Morley, Gildersome and Drighlington. There are many empty warehouse units within the LS27 area and to just concrete over more greenfield sites to make even more empty units is not acceptable.
If the number of proposed developments, residential or warehousing go ahead, the road network will not be able to cope. These are totally unrealistic

Name: Janice Beever

Representor No: PRS00441

Representation ID: REP04791 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: P S Barrie

Representor No: PRS00915

Representation ID: REP04781 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Representation ID: REP04769 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Representation ID: REP04810 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3378

Housing

Geldered Road, Leeds

Name: Lynne Paul

Representor No: PRS01169

Representation ID: REP04800 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: D Paul

Representor No: PRS01183

Representation ID: REP04793 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: R Finnigan

Representor No: PRS01187

Representation ID: REP03285 Question Ref: H1

3378

Name: B Stringer

Representor No: PRS01606

Representation ID: REP04797 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: L.e Beever

Representor No: PRS01607

Representation ID: REP04804 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: J Cowie

Representor No: PRS02227

Representation ID: REP04768 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Susan Holt

Representor No: PRS02289

Representation ID: REP04772 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Dereck Holt

Representor No: PRS02311

Representation ID: REP04766 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3378

Housing

Geldered Road, Leeds

Name: Jenni Davenport

Representor No: PRS02330

Representation ID: REP04770 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Frank Raven

Representor No: PRS02339

Representation ID: REP04771 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: E Naylor

Representor No: PRS02363

Representation ID: REP04780 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Kathleen Paver

Representor No: PRS02372

Representation ID: REP04774 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: C Guy

Representor No: PRS02377

Representation ID: REP04767 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: C Clegg

Representor No: PRS02406

Representation ID: REP04663 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Doreen Gill

Representor No: PRS02496

Representation ID: REP04755 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: D Naylor

Representor No: PRS02497

Representation ID: REP04773 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3378

Housing

Geldered Road, Leeds

Name: A Paver

Representor No: PRS02498

Representation ID: REP04775 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: James Bowers

Representor No: PRS02500

Representation ID: REP04777 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Alan Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02501

Representation ID: REP04778 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Vivienne Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02502

Representation ID: REP04779 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Vivian Oxtoby

Representor No: PRS02504

Representation ID: REP04783 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Beryl Hewitt

Representor No: PRS02506

Representation ID: REP04785 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: D A Clegg

Representor No: PRS02507

Representation ID: REP04788 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Pauline Wood

Representor No: PRS02508

Representation ID: REP04790 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3378

Housing

Geldered Road, Leeds

Name: Joyce Thompson

Representor No: PRS02510

Representation ID: REP04792 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Patricia Aston

Representor No: PRS02513

Representation ID: REP04796 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: L. G Wilson

Representor No: PRS02515

Representation ID: REP04799 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: S Laurence

Representor No: PRS02517

Representation ID: REP04801 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: C Graham

Representor No: PRS02518

Representation ID: REP04803 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: M Allsop

Representor No: PRS02520

Representation ID: REP04805 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: R Hartill

Representor No: PRS02521

Representation ID: REP04806 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Edith Holmes

Representor No: PRS02522

Representation ID: REP04808 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3378

Housing

Geldered Road, Leeds

Name: Harry Holmes

Representor No: PRS02524

Representation ID: REP04811 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Ann Morse

Representor No: PRS02526

Representation ID: REP04813 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: L.r Morse

Representor No: PRS02527

Representation ID: REP04816 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Michael Hartill

Representor No: PRS02556

Representation ID: REP04847 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Jim Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02561

Representation ID: REP04852 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Helen Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02562

Representation ID: REP04855 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Ronald Gill

Representor No: PRS02564

Representation ID: REP04858 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: A.w Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02565

Representation ID: REP04859 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3378

Housing

Geldered Road, Leeds

Name: J Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02566

Representation ID: REP04860 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Norman Dearden

Representor No: PRS02568

Representation ID: REP04857 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 4 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' and 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network.

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network)

From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service frequency levels.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites - green sites are linked to this comment]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H1

Agree with green allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H1

Agree with green allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3386

Housing

Royds Lane, Wortley, Leeds

Name: Hoare

Representor No: PRS05410

Representation ID: REP06016 Question Ref: H4

3386 – Makro Store, Royds Lane, Lower Wortley Road

4.38 This site is currently occupied by an existing retail store in a mixed employment / residential area. Given the site's location the council have identified the site as being suitable for either employment or residential development. While we don't contest the site's suitability for development, we question its deliverability.

4.39 It is unclear who is promoting the site so unless the council have a clear understanding that the site will come forward in the near future, it should not form an allocation and should be regarded as a windfall site.

Recommendation – reclassify this site as 'red' due to the level of uncertainty surrounding the future intentions of the current occupiers.

Name: Neil Dawson

Representor No: PRS05884

Representation ID: REP06563 Question Ref: H4

The current number of sites required in the Outer South West is 7,200 and notwithstanding my comments above on the overall numbers I would suggest the following changes to site allocations.

The total green and amber housing sites allocated in Outer South West is 9,653 whereas the plan is seeking 5,586 residential units. 1,614 housing units already have planning permission. There is therefore scope to increase the number of housing sites allocated as Red which are therefore not considered suitable for housing allocation.

There are two underlying reasons for revising the allocation of sites from Green and Amber to Red.

Firstly to protect the existing Green Belt around Morley and the Green Belt around smaller settlements in the Outer South West. In particular to restrict the sprawl of large built up areas and to prevent Morley and smaller settlements from merging to existing townships.

Secondly in my submission to the LDF in April 2012 I identified the Beeston Royds area in Outer South West as an area suitable for further significant housing development. This area is on the edge of the main urban area of Leeds. It has very good existing road links (the A61, A58 and the A6110) and it is close to the M621/M62.

There is a mixture of employment and residential use in the area and careful planning in the area should allow both employment and residential developments to take place for the duration of the plan.

Suggested sites to move from Amber to Green;

141
2078
3056
3386
4029

Site 141 is currently in employment use but is a brownfield site and as such should be considered for residential development ahead of other potential Greenfield sites.

The sites 3056, 2078, 4029 and 3386 are located in the Beeston Royds area in Farnley and Wortley ward and should be considered for residential development.

These sites could link with existing development in the area which is part of the main Leeds urban area. These developments will require a new road linking Gelderd Road and Whitehall Road but given the number of housing units this should be economically viable. The area would then have good access to the existing road network, at the Leeds Outer Ring Road and the M621/M62. It is close to retail facilities at Junction One, the White Rose Centre plus local shops in Lower Wortley. There is also potential for primary school development in the area if the total number of sites is expanded.

See rep for full details

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3386

Housing

Royds Lane, Wortley, Leeds

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H4

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Amber Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are be minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H4

Disagree with Council's amber assessment, think the site should be green

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H4

Site 3386 - Next to brownfield site 637 marked green. The two could be developed together; on edge of Leeds Main Urban Area. Amber to green.

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H4

Disagree with Council's amber assessment, think the site should be green

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H4

Site 3386 - Next to brownfield site 637 marked green. The two could be developed together; on edge of Leeds Main Urban Area. Amber to green.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3387

Housing

Geldered Road, Asquith Avenue, Gildersome, Leeds

Name: John A Clark

Representor No: PRS00813

Representation ID: REP02826 Question Ref: H7

3387 / 1112 - Better suited for housing.

Name: Richard Coldron

Representor No: PRS04196

Representation ID: REP00327 Question Ref: H3

3060, 3387, 1112, 3059, 3058 Should be green. Ideal opportunity to extend village towards city and green a new community. Road network (Gelderd Road) has low traffic flows due to parallel M621 and would be capable of sustaining more traffic.

Representation ID: REP00327 Question Ref: H11

3060, 3387, 1112 all short term

Name: Katrina Whitbread

Representor No: PRS04446

Representation ID: REP00553 Question Ref: H3

3387, 1112, 343 & 3007 would it seem have minimal impact on residents and most of it is set in an industrial area

Representation ID: REP00553 Question Ref: H6

3387, 1112, 343 & 3007/3039 would it seem have minimal impact on residents and most of it is set in an industrial area

Representation ID: REP00553 Question Ref: H7

3387, 1112, 343 & 3007/3039 would it seem have minimal impact on residents and most of it is set in an industrial area

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 - Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2 - Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3 - Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4 - Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5 - Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network. From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3387

Housing

Geldered Road, Asquith Avenue, Gildersome, Leeds

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3394

Housing

Dewsbury Road, Leeds, LS11 7DF

Name: Lisa Russell

Representor No: PRS05120

Representation ID: REP06004 Question Ref: H1

This representation is prepared on behalf of our client Bizspace with reference to their site, Sugar Mill, located off Dewsbury Road, to the south-west of the Leeds City Centre. A copy of a site and location plan is attached which confirms the boundaries of the site within my client's ownership. This letter should be considered as a representation to the Site Allocations Development Plan Document, Issues and Options Paper.

Volume 1: Plan Overview

Retail Overview

My client wishes to support the retail overview, particularly section 7.1 which focuses retail development in existing centres and within new boundaries identified to accommodate additional retail development. We specifically note the intention to allocate a new centre at Tommy Wass in Map 3 'Hierarchy of Centres - Town and Local Centre Designations', which is fully commended and we consider that this is a suitable and sustainable approach, securing and building upon the existing facilities in the local area. Moreover, this helps to provide shopping and other town centre uses needs near to where the local population live and work and reduces the need to travel. Which meets with the aims and policy requirements of the NPPF and Core Strategy.

Sections 7.9 - 7.11 advises that some of the centres have nearby opportunities for new retail development and, where these exist, have been identified. It also states that, where retail is related to the centre, that the boundary will be revised, where possible. In Volume 2 the southerly part of our client's site, fronting Dewsbury Road is one such opportunity which has been identified adjacent to the Tommy Wass proposed centre. We consider that 1acre of the site, fronting Dewsbury Road is a suitable retail opportunity which exists directly adjacent to the proposed centre (and notwithstanding that the use is already a 'town centre use', offices, and could be included on that basis) should be included within the boundary as a retail opportunity site. It is not physically detached from the centre in any way and we do not consider that there is any reason why it should not form part of this new centre. Indeed, should the retail opportunity be realised at this site, this would help re-enforce and consolidate the new centre and regenerate an underused site. Furthermore, the allocation of the site meets with the core planning principles identified in the NPPF, particularly in proactively driving and supporting sustainable economic development to deliver a thriving local place, responding positively to opportunities for growth and delivering missed use developments on brownfield sites.

In these terms, we support the proposal to amend the centre boundaries to take account of opportunity sites where these relate to a centre. We respectfully request that this approach is applied to our client's site and that the boundary is extended to include 1acre at the front of our client's site, as forming part of the Tommy Wass centre.

Housing Overview

We acknowledge and support the approach taken to sieve out unsuitable sites and, thereafter, to undertake a detailed assessment of the suitability of each site, resulting in a traffic light system to identify the sites with the greatest potential to be allocated for housing. Our client's site was identified as a 'green' site therefore, a site with the greatest potential to be allocated for housing. We agree that our client's site should be green but do not consider that the assessment fully addresses cumulative benefits when developed alongside adjacent sites. The housing strategy only appears to consider the housing allocation (and indeed the retail opportunity to the front of my client's site) individually, rather than as composite parts of a significant regeneration development for Tommy Wass. In these terms we consider that the housing strategy should look closely at promoting 'green' sites adjacent to other development sites which will afford a wider regeneration effect and should therefore be identified as a priority development site for residential, developable in the short term.

No consideration seems to have been given to the existing character of the surrounding area. My client's site is located directly adjacent to and would maintain the character of an established residential area. Moreover, it would create less conflict than the existing use. Appropriate design could also help improve links through the site, for the existing residential population, allowing easier access to the Tommy Wass centre and public transportation system.

Under the new permitted development rights this part of the site may benefit from conversion of the offices to housing and therefore, an allocation would allow developers to consider the most appropriate form and density of residential development, rather than depending solely on conversion of the existing building.

Volume 2: 10 Outer South West

Outer South West Retail Issues and Options

We support the inclusion of the Tommy Wass as a new proposed centre, but note that the boundary on Plan 10.2 extends directly to the west of our client's site, but does not include it. However, within table 10.2.4 the comments section confirms that the site, reference: CFMS019, is already located in the centre and that retail is acceptable, pending other planning consideration. We respectfully request that given the existing office use of the site and confirmation that the site represents a suitable retail opportunity site, that the section fronting Dewsbury Road is included within the centre boundary as it appears that its exclusion from the boundary is an error, as it is inconsistent with table 10.2.4. With no other sites within the Tommy Wass boundary, there is little, or no, further opportunity to promote further investment in the centre. Accordingly, our client's site represents the only sustainable allocation to allow any potential future needs of the local area to be met within the plan period. Furthermore, we agree and support the Council's assessment of sites under 10.2.4, that our client's site represents the most sequentially preferable site put forward under the call for sites exercise and therefore meets with the requirements of the NPPF and Core Strategy, which seek to promote a centre first strategy. We support the proposed allocation of the front part of the site for retail, as part of a wider mixed use development.

Outer South West Housing Issues and Options

We support the approach taken by the Council to sieve out sites which have been removed from further consideration, as per page 17 Volume 1.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3394

Housing

Dewsbury Road, Leeds, LS11 7DF

Name: Lisa Russell

Representor No: PRS05120

We support the categorisation of the remaining pool of sites into a traffic light system, and agree with the assessment that the Sugar Mill site, reference 3394 should be coded 'green' (meaning a site which has the greatest potential to be allocated for housing). Moreover, table 10.3.3 confirms that our client's site is a brownfield site within the urban area, suitable for residential use in principle. It should be noted that this forms part of a wider mixed use proposal which would include a comprehensive development of retail to the front and would retain an element of employment. This mixed use development would secure investment towards the newly allocated Tommy Wass centre and would help secure its vitality and viability.

We consider that the sites identified as 'green' represent the most suitable sites to consider allocating for future housing development. On the basis of the assessment questions against which each site has been assessed, the green sites represent the most sustainable proposals, which will deliver the greatest benefits to new residents and the surrounding community. These sites experience fewer, if any, constraints and therefore offer the most realistic and viable option for development over the plan period and their allocation should be prioritised.

We consider that the Sugar Mill site should be allocated for delivery/development in the short term, and brought forward as part of the larger, mixed-use development of the Sugar Mill site.

Sustainability Assessment

My client's site has been considered by the sustainability assessment as two separate sites. As per our comments above, we consider that the redevelopment of the full site to provide a mixed- use scheme should also be taken into account when assessing the suitability of these specific retail and residential allocations. We support the assessment of the site against the sustainability indicators, but have comments which we would ask are considered when making the final allocations.

Assessment of the Retail Allocation 3394

Under indicators SA1 and SA2, the site is rated as poor with regard to maintaining or improving employment sites and conditions to allow economic growth and investment. No account has been taken that the current site experiences vacancies and the site is continuously marketed. Conversion to retail will secure a higher number of permanent jobs within the area, for people who live near the area and would support equal employment opportunities. Furthermore, if included within the Tommy Wass centre, would help secure the role of the centre and lead to further investment in the local area. Also, as part of a wider mixed use development, a range of uses, including employment, could be promoted. We therefore consider that the scores of SA1 and SA2 should be increased to neutral or good.

Indicator SA11 relates to the re-use of brownfield land and promoting the services for communities. The site is rated as good. It is a brownfield site directly adjacent to the Tommy Wass centre and in close proximity to a large residential population. We consider the redevelopment of this site for retail will secure jobs and services for the local population and therefore should be classed as very good.

Indicator SA15 relates to the transport network and the provision of services, reducing the need to travel by means other than the car. The site has been rated as good, we consider that the redevelopment to retail would help improve the retail offer in Tommy Wass, thereby significantly reducing the need for the local population to travel by car to other locations. It will also provide a local service, easily accessible by pedestrians and cyclist. Furthermore, the site is well serviced by public transport on Dewsbury Road. On this basis, we consider that the site should be rated very good.

Assessment of Housing Allocation CFSM019

Indicator SA18 relates to the reduction of pollution. The site is currently rated as poor. We consider that the rationalisation and redevelopment of the site will not be any more polluting than the existing employment use and should therefore be rated as neutral.

We trust that you will have regard to our letter of representation when preparing the next stage of the plan. Should you require any further clarification, please contact Lisa Russell on the number below. In the meantime, we look forward to receiving confirmation of the safe receipt of this letter.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3394

Housing

Dewsbury Road, Leeds, LS11 7DF

Name: Bizspace

Representor No: PRS05122

Representation ID: REP07762 Question Ref: H1

Site 3394

Our client's site was identified as a 'green' site therefore, a site with the greatest potential to be allocated for housing. We agree that our client's site should be green but do not consider that the assessment fully addresses cumulative benefits when developed alongside adjacent sites. The housing strategy only appears to consider the housing allocation (and indeed the retail opportunity to the front of my client's site) individually, rather than as composite parts of a significant regeneration development for Tommy Wass.

No consideration seems to have been given to the existing character of the surrounding area. My client's site is located directly adjacent to and would maintain the character of an established residential area. Moreover, it would create less conflict than the existing use. Appropriate design could also help improve links through the site, for the existing residential population, allowing easier access to the Tommy Wass centre and public transportation system.

Under the new permitted development rights this part of the site may benefit from conversion of the offices to housing and therefore, an allocation would allow developers to consider the most appropriate form and density of residential development, rather than depending solely on conversion of the existing building.

Table 10.3.3 confirms that our client's site is a brownfield site within the urban area, suitable for residential use in principle. It should be noted that this forms part of a wider mixed use proposal which would include a comprehensive development of retail to the front and would retain an element of employment. This mixed use development would secure investment towards the newly allocated Tommy Wass centre and would help secure its vitality and viability.

Indicator SA18 relates to the reduction of pollution. The site is currently rated as poor. We consider that the rationalisation and redevelopment of the site will not be any more polluting than the existing employment use and should therefore be rated as neutral.

We consider that the Sugar Mill site should be allocated for delivery/development in the short term, and brought forward as part of the larger, mixed-use development of the Sugar Mill site.

See rep for full details

Representation ID: REP07762 Question Ref: H11

Site 3394

We consider that the Sugar Mill site should be allocated for delivery/development in the short term, and brought forward as part of the larger, mixed-use development of the Sugar Mill site.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 4 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' and 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network.

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network)

From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service frequency levels.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites - green sites are linked to this comment]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3394

Housing

Dewsbury Road, Leeds, LS11 7DF

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H1

Agree with green allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H1

Agree with green allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3397

Housing

116 Old Lane, Leeds

Name: Hoare

Representor No: PRS05410

Representation ID: REP06016 Question Ref: H4

3397 – 116 Old Lane, Beeston

4.40 We strongly question this site as a proposed residential allocation. The site is located within Beeston which benefits from a wide range of services and facilities. On paper this site would form a logical infill development. However the site located between a foodstore and other employment uses. There is currently a pending planning application for a retail store. By the councils own admission, the site would therefore be most appropriate for employment use.

Recommendation - reclassify the site in 'red' due the councils initial recommendation that the site would be most appropriate for an employment use.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H4

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 4 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' and 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network.

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network)

From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service frequency levels.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites - amber sites are linked to this comment]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H4

Agree with amber allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H4

Agree with amber allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3428

Housing

Land off Daisy Hill Close, Morley, Leeds

Name: D Paul

Representor No: PRS01183

Representation ID: REP08289 Question Ref: H1

3428 -
Totally unsuitable site as it has three exits all on to congested roads. The schools in the local area are at capacity and with no new schools planned it looks bleak.
The road system is at best slow at worse solid. The whole idea is flawed at best a disaster.

Name: Martin Proctor

Representor No: PRS01553

Representation ID: REP03696 Question Ref: H1

3428 Land of daisyhill close

Name: Persimmon Homes

Representor No: PRS05691

Representation ID: REP07054 Question Ref: H1

LAND AT DAISY HILL MORLEY SITE REF 388 [assume respondent means site ref 3428]

On behalf of our client Persimmon Homes (Leeds) I write in connection with the above site and associated consultation.

We have reviewed the consultation documentation and we are pleased to note that the site has been identified as green in the Site Allocations DPD. We support this notation.

By way of context, land at Daisy Hill is allocated for housing site in the adopted UDP under site reference H3-2A.06. Development of the site is therefore acceptable in principle. The site benefits from planning permission for development and this was granted in December 2012 under decision reference 12/04048/FU.

This recent planning decision demonstrates that development of the site has been considered and found to be acceptable. Therefore the site meets the tests of availability, suitability and viability as set out in the NPPF. We therefore consider that it is entirely appropriate that this site be identified as green in the site assessment on this basis and continued forward as a site allocation in due course.

We also note that applications to discharge conditions associated with planning permission 12/04048/FU have also been submitted for consideration. This shows that it is Persimmon Homes' intention to proceed with the permitted development and to deliver much needed housing in the Outer South West Housing Market Area and Morley. Again this demonstrates further the deliverability of the site and its' appropriateness for allocation.

Therefore we support the proposed notation in this case and the continuation of this site as a deliverable housing allocation.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3428

Housing

Land off Daisy Hill Close, Morley, Leeds

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 4 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' and 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network.

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network)

From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service frequency levels.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites - green sites are linked to this comment]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H1

Disagree with Council's green assessment, think the site should be red

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H1

Disagree with Council's green assessment, think the site should be red

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3456A

Housing

Land off Haigh Moor Road

Name: Brian Guy

Representor No: PRS00142

Representation ID: REP04659 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: Wenda P Whitehead

Representor No: PRS00312

Representation ID: REP04786 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: Janice Beever

Representor No: PRS00441

Representation ID: REP04791 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: P S Barrie

Representor No: PRS00915

Representation ID: REP04810 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Representation ID: REP04769 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Representation ID: REP04781 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Representation ID: REP03109 Question Ref: H1

3456a Off Haigh Moor Road - Green to Red

Offers restricted access onto busy road - already at capacity

At side of access point / parking area for those visiting Ardsley Reservoir site

Would be potential for congestion on approach roads and into any new estate

Real potential for accidents

Schools and doctors full up in the area

Representation ID: REP02944 Question Ref: H1

3456a Off Haigh Moor Road - Green to Red

Offers restricted access onto busy road - already at capacity.

At the side of the access point / parking area for those visiting Ardsley Reservoir site - would be potential for congestion on approach roads and into any new estate. Real potential for accidents.

Schools and doctors full up in this area.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3456A

Housing

Land off Haigh Moor Road

Name: Amy Weldon

Representor No: PRS00980

Representation ID: REP03023 Question Ref: H1

3456a Haigh Moor Road - Green to Red

Close Proximity to reservoir car park

Site already congested due to excess traffic and car park, used for anti social behaviour on evenings

Name: Alan Weldon

Representor No: PRS01062

Representation ID: REP03126 Question Ref: H1

3456a Haigh Moor Road- Green to Red

Part car park to reservoir for visitors

Name: H I Weldon

Representor No: PRS01063

Representation ID: REP03127 Question Ref: H1

3456a Haigh Moor Road - Green to Red

Car park to reservoir for visitors

Name: A V Jarvis

Representor No: PRS01112

Representation ID: REP03164 Question Ref: H1

Site 3456a

A green belt site which if used would create continuous ribbon development along Haigh Moor Road.

This site is divided by the reservoir road, alongside which there is a parking area (shown on Plan 10.5 Types of Greenspace, Site Allocations Plan Volume 2: 10 Outer South West)

The parking area was built to stop parked cars blocking the road. Even with the parking area, overspill parking still takes place on Haigh Moor Road, especially if the weather is good. Building on this green belt site could only increase traffic problems.

Name: Michael Stilwell

Representor No: PRS01133

Representation ID: REP03207 Question Ref: H1

3456A

Lack of amenities – the amenities in the area cannot support the existing population of West Ardsley, never mind accepting an influx of possibly 5000 more.

- Virtually all the shops have closed over the years, there are now only 3 grocery shops in the area. Anyone living at the southern end of Haigh Moor Road has over 1 mile to travel to the nearest shop.

- The schools are overcrowded, Westerton Road has had more external classrooms added, so it cannot be extended. Hill Top School is nearly full now from the existing population growth, again it is extremely limited in expansion possibilities.

- Bus services are pathetic, services to Leeds, Dewsbury and Wakefield are hourly at best. Batley is only accessible from Wakefield –Batley Road. There are areas where buses have been removed completely. This week another service has been stopped.

- There are not any play areas for children, your own survey records this failing.

- There is only one medical centre with 8 doctors giving cover to some existing 15000 patients. To get an appointment with a specific GP can take 3 weeks, the centre has recently been extended to its limits so there is nowhere to go. Also there is only one pharmacist.

Traffic

All the roads in the area are in a bad state of repair, I have lived here for 28 years and Haigh Moor Road has never been resurfaced despite 3 new housing estates accessing it. In June 1992 the planning inspector denied a planning application (91/23/00350) for an annex for an invalid because although neither he nor his brother drove. The reason for this was "I am concerned that were an additional dwelling to be provided there would be no guarantee that it would not lead to additional traffic generation at some future time, perhaps through changed circumstances, with consequent adverse impact on highway safety." Yet here we are with a further 70 houses at Foxfields and Jude's Pond and a proposed 179 on these new sites, probably adding in excess of 500 vehicles to Haigh Moor Road.

There has been a water leak on HMR which despite being reported to Yorkshire Water is still flowing after 3 months and has now become 2 leaks. The western end of Westerton Road is in a dangerous state with potholes and speed restriction bumps. LCC appears to be unable to keep up with the maintenance of its roads in South Leeds.

LCC's attitude to this area seems to be that Ardsley is an outpost on the borders with Wakefield and Kirklees and beyond the borough or Morley, so we can be conveniently ignored. Ardsley is quite definitely being asked to provide the lion's share of new housing without any benefit, it has poor services and has become a dormitory area of Leeds.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3456A

Housing

Land off Haigh Moor Road

Name: Lynne Paul

Representor No: PRS01169

Representation ID: REP04800 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: D Paul

Representor No: PRS01183

Representation ID: REP04793 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: D, P & A Fletcher / Fletcher / Latt

Representor No: PRS01454

Representation ID: REP03579 Question Ref: H1

Judes Pond, Haigh Moor Road, behind Redrow Homes [assume 3456A and B]

Greenfield area, use up brown belt ones. If building goes ahead on this field, wildlife will suffer, views from other houses ruined, noise level will increase as on a hill, not being informed generally, flooding in local areas.

Name: B Stringer

Representor No: PRS01606

Representation ID: REP04797 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: L.e Beever

Representor No: PRS01607

Representation ID: REP04804 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3456A

Housing

Land off Haigh Moor Road

Name: Tim Chapman

Representor No: PRS01644

Representation ID: REP03799 Question Ref: H1

3456A -

I am making my response by letter; the online boxes rejected my comments because they exceed 3,000 digits.

3373A Haigh Wood, West Ardsley, 3373C Haigh Wood, West Ardsley, 1336 Westerton Road, West Ardsley, 3456A Ardsley Reservoir, 1258 Westerton Road, Tingley, 3365 Westerton Road, Tingley, 1032 Bradford Road, 1143B & 1143D Thorpe Lane, Tingley.

Objections.

The Core Strategy seeks to be "fair". The word is used in paragraph 1.2 and again in 1.14. Yet the proposed green housing sites when taken together would definitely not be fair to West Ardsley and Tingley. No justification has been given as to why there is such a concentration here, nor any evidence of local need. Indeed, paragraph 4.6.14 states that "The SHMA 2011 was not able to identify any geographically specific need for new housing based on population growth." The 13 green housing sites in Ardsley and Tingley seem to have been assessed individually rather than their cumulative impact. This impact is potentially very much greater when considered alongside Kirklees Council's proposals for the Chidswell area, and comes on top of the huge impact on West Ardsley of major housing development in the 1990s - the estates now accessed by Lowry Road and Constable Road. The newly proposed sites taken together would consolidate semi-rural groups of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area. Most of the open frontages to Bradford Road and Westerton Road would be built on, removing open aspects and distant views and tending towards the creation of amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the length of the A650.

Site 3456A. Additional objections.

Core Strategy policy SP1 (iii) states: "For development to respect and enhance the local character and identity of places and neighbourhoods". The local character and identity of West Ardsley would be seriously threatened by 3456A, especially when combined with sites 3373A, 536, 3373C and 1336. Haigh Moor Road has lost most of its open frontages to development; development of 3456A would change the character of this important road and the perception of the area from one of loosely knit settlements to a predominantly urban area. It would destroy views not only of the open land but of Ardsley Reservoir and more distantly to East Ardsley and beyond. The reservoir is a very important open space asset and used in large numbers by local people; development of 3456A would relegate it to a backland site hidden by houses and invisible from the local road network. Its Green Belt status should be preserved and the site shown red instead of green.

Representation ID: REP05648 Question Ref: H1

Local Development Framework, Site Allocations Plan, Public Consultation.

I am making my response by letter; the online boxes rejected my comments because they exceed 3,000 digits.

3373A Haigh Wood, West Ardsley, 3373C Haigh Wood, West Ardsley, 1336 Westerton Road, West Ardsley, 3456A Ardsley Reservoir, 1258 Westerton Road, Tingley, 3365 Westerton Road, Tingley, 1032 Bradford Road, 1143B & 1143D Thorpe Lane, Tingley.

Objections.

The Core Strategy seeks to be "fair". The word is used in paragraph 1.2 and again in 1.14. Yet the proposed green housing sites when taken together would definitely not be fair to West Ardsley and Tingley. No justification has been given as to why there is such a concentration here, nor any evidence of local need. Indeed, paragraph 4.6.14 states that "The SHMA 2011 was not able to identify any geographically specific need for new housing based on population growth." The 13 green housing sites in Ardsley and Tingley seem to have been assessed individually rather than their cumulative impact. This impact is potentially very much greater when considered alongside Kirklees Council's proposals for the Chidswell area, and comes on top of the huge impact on West Ardsley of major housing development in the 1990s - the estates now accessed by Lowry Road and Constable Road. The newly proposed sites taken together would consolidate semi-rural groups of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area. Most of the open frontages to Bradford Road and Westerton Road would be built on, removing open aspects and distant views and tending towards the creation of amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the length of the A650.

Site 3456A. Additional objections.

Core Strategy policy SP1 (iii) states: "For development to respect and enhance the local character and identity of places and neighbourhoods". The local character and identity of West Ardsley would be seriously threatened by 3456A, especially when combined with sites 3373A, 536, 3373C and 1336. Haigh Moor Road has lost most of its open frontages to development; development of 3456A would change the character of this important road and the perception of the area from one of loosely knit settlements to a predominantly urban area. It would destroy views not only of the open land but of Ardsley Reservoir and more distantly to East Ardsley and beyond. The reservoir is a very important open space asset and used in large numbers by local people; development of 3456A would relegate it to a backland site hidden by houses and invisible from the local road network. Its Green Belt status should be preserved and the site shown red instead of green.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3456A

Housing

Land off Haigh Moor Road

Name: Tim Chapman

Representor No: PRS01644

Representation ID: REP05648 Question Ref: H1

Local Development Framework, Site Allocations Plan, Public Consultation.

I am making my response by letter; the online boxes rejected my comments because they exceed 3,000 digits.

3373A Haigh Wood, West Ardsley, 3373C Haigh Wood, West Ardsley,
1336 Westerton Road, West Ardsley, 3456A Ardsley Reservoir,
1258 Westerton Road, Tingley, 3365 Westerton Road, Tingley,
1032 Bradford Road, 1143B & 1143D Thorpe Lane, Tingley.
Objections.

The Core Strategy seeks to be "fair". The word is used in paragraph 1.2 and again in 1.14. Yet the proposed green housing sites when taken together would definitely not be fair to West Ardsley and Tingley. No justification has been given as to why there is such a concentration here, nor any evidence of local need. Indeed, paragraph 4.6.14 states that "The SHMA 2011 was not able to identify any geographically specific need for new housing based on population growth." The 13 green housing sites in Ardsley and Tingley seem to have been assessed individually rather than their cumulative impact. This impact is potentially very much greater when considered alongside Kirklees Council's proposals for the Chidswell area, and comes on top of the huge impact on West Ardsley of major housing development in the 1990s - the estates now accessed by Lowry Road and Constable Road. The newly proposed sites taken together would consolidate semi-rural groups of settlements into a predominantly urban residential area. Most of the open frontages to Bradford Road and Westerton Road would be built on, removing open aspects and distant views and tending towards the creation of amorphous sprawl of development across the area along the length of the A650.

Name: J Cowie

Representor No: PRS02227

Representation ID: REP04768 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: Susan Holt

Representor No: PRS02289

Representation ID: REP04772 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: Dereck Holt

Representor No: PRS02311

Representation ID: REP04766 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: Jenni Davenport

Representor No: PRS02330

Representation ID: REP04770 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3456A

Housing

Land off Haigh Moor Road

Name: Frank Raven

Representor No: PRS02339

Representation ID: REP04771 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: E Naylor

Representor No: PRS02363

Representation ID: REP04780 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: Kathleen Paver

Representor No: PRS02372

Representation ID: REP04774 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: C Guy

Representor No: PRS02377

Representation ID: REP04767 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: C Clegg

Representor No: PRS02406

Representation ID: REP04663 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: Doreen Gill

Representor No: PRS02496

Representation ID: REP04755 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: D Naylor

Representor No: PRS02497

Representation ID: REP04773 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3456A

Housing

Land off Haigh Moor Road

Name: A Paver

Representor No: PRS02498

Representation ID: REP04775 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: James Bowers

Representor No: PRS02500

Representation ID: REP04777 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: Alan Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02501

Representation ID: REP04778 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: Vivienne Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02502

Representation ID: REP04779 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: Vivian Oxtoby

Representor No: PRS02504

Representation ID: REP04783 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: Beryl Hewitt

Representor No: PRS02506

Representation ID: REP04785 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: D A Clegg

Representor No: PRS02507

Representation ID: REP04788 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3456A

Housing

Land off Haigh Moor Road

Name: Pauline Wood

Representor No: PRS02508

Representation ID: REP04790 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: Joyce Thompson

Representor No: PRS02510

Representation ID: REP04792 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: Patricia Aston

Representor No: PRS02513

Representation ID: REP04796 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: L. G Wilson

Representor No: PRS02515

Representation ID: REP04799 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: S Laurence

Representor No: PRS02517

Representation ID: REP04801 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: C Graham

Representor No: PRS02518

Representation ID: REP04803 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: M Allsop

Representor No: PRS02520

Representation ID: REP04805 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3456A

Housing

Land off Haigh Moor Road

Name: R Hartill

Representor No: PRS02521

Representation ID: REP04806 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: Edith Holmes

Representor No: PRS02522

Representation ID: REP04808 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: Harry Holmes

Representor No: PRS02524

Representation ID: REP04811 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: Ann Morse

Representor No: PRS02526

Representation ID: REP04813 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: L.r Morse

Representor No: PRS02527

Representation ID: REP04816 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: Michael Hartill

Representor No: PRS02556

Representation ID: REP04847 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: Jim Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02561

Representation ID: REP04852 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3456A

Housing

Land off Haigh Moor Road

Name: Helen Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02562

Representation ID: REP04855 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: Ronald Gill

Representor No: PRS02564

Representation ID: REP04858 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: A.w Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02565

Representation ID: REP04859 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: J Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02566

Representation ID: REP04860 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: Norman Dearden

Representor No: PRS02568

Representation ID: REP04857 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Res, Site Capacity 41, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood

Development of this site would complete urban infill along Haigh Moor Road. The local infrastructure is unable to cope with such an addition.

Egress from Haigh Moor Road is difficult at either end and existing new developments are adding to the burden The cumulative total of proposed new households is now 1275.

Name: Annie McNally

Representor No: PRS03059

Representation ID: REP00387 Question Ref: G1

I think it is disgusting that the council are wanting to build on greenbelt land on proposed Plots 1336, 3373, 3372, 3373A, 3373B, 3373C, 1330B, 1330A, 536. And 3456A. It is an area of outstanding beauty where people enjoy walking, running, playing and riding horses. Many wild animals live in the fields and to take it away would turn this area into a concrete jungle. It would mean my view at the back would be eradicated, lowering the value of my house, but more importantly the pleasure I have everyday when I look across the field. This city needs green areas where we can walk and get away from the stresses of life. Also, to the rear of my property there is bindweed in the field which I believe would make it difficult for any developers to be able to build on that land. There are plenty of brown field sites which can be developed. Do not take away our green spaces. Totally outrageous.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3456A

Housing

Land off Haigh Moor Road

Name: Richard Marshall

Representor No: PRS03170

Representation ID: REP01024 Question Ref: H5

1079, 1072, 1077, 1143B, 1143D, 1171B, 1200A, 1258, 1284a, 1285, 1344, 2098a, 3365, 3456A.2098C, 2105, 2155, 3000, 3056.3064, 3078A, 4004, and 4029. As previously stated the amber sites that are greenbelt land should not be considered for development. Site 1032 is designated as a protected area of search this land has been retained along the edge of the existing settlement pending more suitable sites being found in the longer term this site should only be developed as a last resort.

Representation ID: REP01024 Question Ref: H2

1079, 1072, 1077, 1143B, 1143D, 1171B, 1200A, 1258, 1284a, 1285, 1344, 2098a, 3365, 3456A. All these sites are green belt sites , green belt land is there to stop urban sprawl and the destruction of the countryside that still remains in this area. If sites 1143B, 1143D, 1143F, 2155, 1274, 1032, and 2128 are built on East Ardsley West Ardsley and Tingley will just become one built up area hemmed in by the M62. Not all of these are greenbelt sites but if the development is allowed the basic principal of having greenbelt in this area will be completely wrecked!

Name: Sarah Emmett

Representor No: PRS04725

Representation ID: REP01185 Question Ref: H9

3456A - Ardsley Reservoir - Half of this site provides a car park to the well used Ardsley reservoir. The car park is always busy - all day, every day and there seems to be no mention of this in the site description. Traffic / parking on Haigh Moor Road gets very busy when the car park is full and people frequently have to walk into the road as cars half park on the pavement, blocking access for wheelchair users / people with prams / buggies. If this car park was removed, access would be restricted and parking on the road would become a nightmare. When we moved to the area, we had discussions with LCC planning policy officers and they assured us that this land should not be built on. However, it already appears that a planning application is being prepared from the surveys that have taken place. If more houses are proposed, serious consideration needs to be giving to local resources, particularly schools, doctors and dentists as these are over stretched already.

Representation ID: REP01185 Question Ref: H2

3456A - Ardsley Reservoir - Half of this site provides a car park to the well used Ardsley reservoir. The car park is always busy - all day, every day and there seems to be no mention of this in the site description. Traffic / parking on Haigh Moor Road gets very busy when the car park is full and people frequently have to walk into the road as cars half park on the pavement, blocking access for wheelchair users / people with prams / buggies. If this car park was removed, access would be restricted and parking on the road would become a nightmare. When we moved to the area, we had discussions with LCC planning policy officers and they assured us that this land should not be built on. However, it already appears that a planning application is being prepared from the surveys that have taken place. If more houses are proposed, serious consideration needs to be given to local resources, particularly schools, doctors and dentists as these are over stretched already.

Name: Keyland Developments Ltd

Representor No: PRS04970

Representation ID: REP01862 Question Ref: H1

The allocation of site number 3456A is supported as a location for sustainable future housing development in the outer south west area. The allocation of the site would represent partial infill development but would retain the openness between the built up area and the reservoir as the proposed site does not extend beyond the existing built up limits. It is considered that a suitable and appropriate boundary to the Green Belt could be drawn that will ensure that the development does not impose on the remaining area of Green Belt. The site is available and deliverable and could provide approximately 40 sustainable new dwellings in the short term 0-5 years to help meet the target of 5586 new dwellings in the area over the plan period.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3456A

Housing

Land off Haigh Moor Road

Name: Lynsey Morris

Representor No: PRS05111

Representation ID: REP05692 Question Ref: H1

Hi,

I would like to object against the planning proposals for the following sites on Map 33 (off Westerton Road)

1336

3373B

3373A

1330B

33732

3365

3373C

3456A

3456B

1258

I suggest that these should all be changed to RED due to the following reasons:

Too much traffic already so roads will be extremely busy right outside my front door. I have young children and will be scared for their safety.

Services such as Doctors surgery's, dentists, local hospitals, schools, supermarkets already too busy so won't be able to cope

Less water will be absorbed into the ground resulting in more flooding in our gardens.

This is currently already happening in several houses on Westerton Road including mine.

There are bats, foxes, owls, frogs, newts and many birds living in the area especially on sites 1336, 3373A, 3373B, 3373C. Should these not be protected?

House prices for homeowners in the area already will decrease.

We moved to the area because of the greenery and our view will be spoilt.

The sewerage system in place on Westerton Road recently failed causing waste from the sewers to overflow into nearby houses. This was due to the recent housing developments that have recently been built nearby so the sewerage system was unable to cope. This could very likely happen again.

Name: D, M, S Johnson And Kenny

Representor No: PRS05119

Representation ID: REP05702 Question Ref: General comment

Firstly I would like to express my disappointment and embarrassment towards the councils plans for the proposed plans listed below. I understand the reason behind the lack of communication with the residents in the area may be beneficial to the local council and certain government groups. It obviously cuts down on man hours and paperwork.

I would like to object against the planning proposals for the following sites on Map 33 (off Westerton Road)

1336

3373B

3373A

1330B

33732

3365

3373C

3456A

3456B

1258

The infrastructure in this area will struggle to cope with the demands of the services required.

The area is attracting wildlife not seen in built up areas. It seems a shame to disregard the wildlife issue I'm sure if a full environmental survey of the area was to be carried out this would scupper the planning permission. But again that would be an extra cost to the council which would have an impact at year end when the books are balanced.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3456A

Housing

Land off Haigh Moor Road

Name: Ian Morris

Representor No: PRS05121

Representation ID: REP05700 Question Ref: H1

Firstly I would like to express my disappointment and embarrassment towards the councils plans for the proposed plans listed below. I understand the reason behind the lack of communication with the residents in the area may be beneficial to the local council and certain government groups. It obviously cuts down on man hours and paperwork.

I would like to object against the planning proposals for the following sites on Map 33 (off Westerton Road)

1336
3373B
3373A
1330B
33732
3365
3373C
3456A
3456B
1258

The infrastructure in this area will struggle to cope with the demands of the services required.

The area is attracting wildlife not seen in built up areas. It seems a shame to disregard the wildlife issue I'm sure if a full environmental survey of the area was to be carried out this would scupper the planning permission. But again that would be an extra cost to the council which would have an impact at year end when the books are balanced.

Name: Lisa Mulherin

Representor No: PRS05734

Representation ID: REP07126 Question Ref: H1

3456A Ardsley Reservoir – This Green Belt site should be re-designated Red because of cumulative impact of new developments along Haigh Moor Road in recent years makes this proposal unsustainable. It would also protect the openness across to the reservoir.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3456A

Housing

Land off Haigh Moor Road

Name: Neil Dawson

Representor No: PRS05884

Representation ID: REP06563 Question Ref: H1

Suggested sites from Green to Red;

1029
1072
1143B
1143D
1200A
1258
1344
3365
3373A
3373C
3456A

All of the above sites are in the current Green Belt with the exception of the 3373A and 3373C which are open land.

The other sites are all located within the existing Green Belt and any development would lead to increased urban sprawl between the various townships in the Outer South West, and lead to coalescence between communities.

Development of the Green Belt sites would also reduce the open green area between settlements and create encroachment into the countryside around Morley.

In addition there is insufficient road capacity in the area particularly the very busy single carriageway A650 from East Ardsley to Tingley. Even if there is no development of the above sites there is in the allocation plan over 1,200 additional new houses close to the A650 which will put additional strain on this busy road.

The Haigh Moor sites are part of a natural valley which is popular for recreational activities. The whole site is considered best treated as one, therefore if the largest part 3373B is not to be used for housing then the other parts of the site should be treated in a similar manner. This should be retained as open green space.

Site 1072 is in the Green Belt and although there are properties adjacent it is located near to the A653 and shares similar characteristics to site 3078B which is not considered suitable for development. A development at this site would set a precedent for incursion into the Green Belt between Leeds and Kirklees.

See rep for full details.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 1 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if these sites would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. Significant developer contributions will be required at these sites to improve the public transport to meet the council LDF accessibility policies; particularly in the larger sites should these be brought forward for development. These include SHLAA ref: 2062, 1032, 1046, 1017 & 1055.

Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small sites low capacity are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

The table also includes accessibility assessments results to access other services and facilities within acceptable journey times on public transport.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3456A

Housing

Land off Haigh Moor Road

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H1

Disagree with Council's green assessment, think the site should be red

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H1

Disagree with Council's green assessment, think the site should be red

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3456B

Housing

Land off Haigh Moor Road

Name: Michael Stilwell

Representor No: PRS01133

Representation ID: REP03207 Question Ref: H7

3456A
Lack of amenities – the amenities in the area cannot support the existing population of West Ardsley, never mind accepting an influx of possibly 5000 more.
- Virtually all the shops have closed over the years, there are now only 3 grocery shops in the area. Anyone living at the southern end of Haigh Moor Road has over 1 mile to travel to the nearest shop.
- The schools are overcrowded, Westerton Road has had more external classrooms added, so it cannot be extended. Hill Top School is nearly full now from the existing population growth, again it is extremely limited in expansion possibilities.
- Bus services are pathetic, services to Leeds, Dewsbury and Wakefield are hourly at best. Batley is only accessible from Wakefield –Batley Road. There are areas where buses have been removed completely. This week another service has been stopped.
- There are not any play areas for children, your own survey records this failing.
- There is only one medical centre with 8 doctors giving cover to some existing 15000 patients. To get an appointment with a specific GP can take 3 weeks, the centre has recently been extended to its limits so there is nowhere to go. Also there is only one pharmacist.

Traffic
All the roads in the area are in a bad state of repair, I have lived here for 28 years and Haigh Moor Road has never been resurfaced despite 3 new housing estates accessing it. In June 1992 the planning inspector denied a planning application (91/23/00350) for an annex for an invalid because although neither he nor his brother drove. The reason for this was “I am concerned that were an additional dwelling to be provided there would be no guarantee that it would not lead to additional traffic generation at some future time, perhaps through changed circumstances, with consequent adverse impact on highway safety.” Yet here we are with a further 70 houses at Foxfields and Jude's Pond and a proposed 179 on these new sites, probably adding in excess of 500 vehicles to Haigh Moor Road.

There has been a water leak on HMR which despite being reported to Yorkshire Water is still flowing after 3 months and has now become 2 leaks. The western end of Westerton Road is in a dangerous state with potholes and speed restriction bumps. LCC appears to be unable to keep up with the maintenance of its roads in South Leeds.

LCC's attitude to this area seems to be that Ardsley is an outpost on the borders with Wakefield and Kirklees and beyond the borough or Morley, so we can be conveniently ignored. Ardsley is quite definitely being asked to provide the lion's share of new housing without any benefit, it has poor services and has become a dormitory area of Leeds.

Name: D, P & A Fletcher / Fletcher / Latt

Representor No: PRS01454

Representation ID: REP03579 Question Ref: H7

Judes Pond, Haigh Moor Road, behind Redrow Homes [assume 3456A and B]
Greenfield area, use up brown belt ones. If building goes ahead on this field, wildlife will suffer, views from other hosues ruined, noise level will increase as on a hill, not being informed generally, flooding in local areas.

Name: Sarah Emmett

Representor No: PRS04725

Representation ID: REP01185 Question Ref: H7

3456B - Agree that this site should NOT be built on under any circumstances. It provides a buffer zone for the reservoir and a haven for animals - bats, deer, rabbits, birds. It was previously designated as greenbelt and should remain so. Dicussions with LCC Planning Policy Officers before we bought our property assured us that this land would never be built on. The view to the reservoir is a unique USP of our property.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3456B

Housing

Land off Haigh Moor Road

Name: Lynsey Morris

Representor No: PRS05111

Representation ID: REP05692 Question Ref: H7

Hi,

I would like to object against the planning proposals for the following sites on Map 33 (off Westerton Road)

1336

3373B

3373A

1330B

33732

3365

3373C

3456A

3456B

1258

I suggest that these should all be changed to RED due to the following reasons:

Too much traffic already so roads will be extremely busy right outside my front door. I have young children and will be scared for their safety.

Services such as Doctors surgery's, dentists, local hospitals, schools, supermarkets already too busy so won't be able to cope

Less water will be absorbed into the ground resulting in more flooding in our gardens.

This is currently already happening in several houses on Westerton Road including mine.

There are bats, foxes, owls, frogs, newts and many birds living in the area especially on sites 1336, 3373A, 3373B, 3373C. Should these not be protected?

House prices for homeowners in the area already will decrease.

We moved to the area because of the greenery and our view will be spoilt.

The sewerage system in place on Westerton Road recently failed causing waste from the sewers to overflow into nearby houses. This was due to the recent housing developments that have recently been built nearby so the sewerage system was unable to cope. This could very likely happen again.

Name: D, M, S Johnson And Kenny

Representor No: PRS05119

Representation ID: REP05702 Question Ref: H1

Firstly I would like to express my disappointment and embarrassment towards the councils plans for the proposed plans listed below. I understand the reason behind the lack of communication with the residents in the area may be beneficial to the local council and certain government groups. It obviously cuts down on man hours and paperwork.

I would like to object against the planning proposals for the following sites on Map 33 (off Westerton Road)

1336

3373B

3373A

1330B

33732

3365

3373C

3456A

3456B

1258

The infrastructure in this area will struggle to cope with the demands of the services required.

The area is attracting wildlife not seen in built up areas. It seems a shame to disregard the wildlife issue I'm sure if a full environmental survey of the area was to be carried out this would scupper the planning permission. But again that would be an extra cost to the council which would have an impact at year end when the books are balanced.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3456B

Housing

Land off Haigh Moor Road

Name: Ian Morris

Representor No: PRS05121

Representation ID: REP05700 Question Ref: H7

Firstly I would like to express my disappointment and embarrassment towards the councils plans for the proposed plans listed below. I understand the reason behind the lack of communication with the residents in the area may be beneficial to the local council and certain government groups. It obviously cuts down on man hours and paperwork.

I would like to object against the planning proposals for the following sites on Map 33 (off Westerton Road)

1336
3373B
3373A
1330B
33732
3365
3373C
3456A
3456B
1258

The infrastructure in this area will struggle to cope with the demands of the services required.

The area is attracting wildlife not seen in built up areas. It seems a shame to disregard the wildlife issue I'm sure if a full environmental survey of the area was to be carried out this would scupper the planning permission. But again that would be an extra cost to the council which would have an impact at year end when the books are balanced.

Name: Lisa Mulherin

Representor No: PRS05734

Representation ID: REP07126 Question Ref: H7

3456B Ardsley Reservoir - I support the Red designation of this site for the reasons set out in the consultation document and because it would lead to the erosion of the separation between the villages of East and West Ardsley.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3456B

Housing

Land off Haigh Moor Road

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3458

Housing

Wood End Farm, South of Whitehall Road, Farnley

Name: Andrea Davis

Representor No: PRS00074

Representation ID: REP00480 Question Ref: General comment

3458 - I object to the above site reference to be considered for any development. Houses are situated on both sides of Whitehall Road next to and adjacent to this site. There are also two road junctions within 200 yards along this stretch of road. In my opinion access to this site would prove dangerous and hazardous on an already busy road.

Name: William Parsons

Representor No: PRS03570

Representation ID: REP00702 Question Ref: H3

The documents did not show which land is classified as "Green Belt", nor did they show the "Settlement Hierarchy" which has been used to "filter out" the following sites around Farnley: 1273, 2076, 3458. Whilst I support the boundaries of the city of Leeds Urban area not drifting further and further out (for example into Wharfedale) I would not expect exemptions for under-developed areas (for example Farsley and Calverly) at the expense of areas which are already heavily developed (my example in this case being Pudsey). So, I would propose these sites to be re-introduced into the Housing allocation process.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3458

Housing

Wood End Farm, South of Whitehall Road, Farnley

Name: Wortlea Estates

Representor No: PRS05945

Representation ID: REP06711 Question Ref: H1

Site 3458

Whilst the Council has sieved out the Wood End Farm site (ref: 3458) and therefore no assessment of the site has been undertaken by the Council, it is maintained the site is one which has the greatest potential to be allocated (green) or at the very least it should be identified as an amber site.

This site is suitable for housing development, it would form an extension to the settlement of New Farnley and technical supporting reports have been prepared and submitted to the Council (detailed in the next section of this representation statement) which demonstrate there are no development constraints.

The NPPF, at paragraph 52, specifically supports extensions to existing villages and towns, advising the supply of new homes can sometimes be best achieved through planning for larger scale development through such extensions. The Wood End Farm site would result in a sustainable urban extension to New Farnley. The site is well located for access to employment opportunities in Leeds, lies on an existing bus route and is within easy walking distance of shops and services within the settlement, including a co-op foodstore, post office, two primary schools and a senior school.

On the basis of the evidence set out in this statement, it is maintained this site is one which has the greatest potential to be allocated and therefore the site should be identified as a green site, or at the very least, an amber site.

See representation submitted for full details

Representation ID: REP06711 Question Ref: H4

Site 3458

Whilst the Council has sieved out the Wood End Farm site (ref: 3458) and therefore no assessment of the site has been undertaken by the Council, it is maintained the site is one which has the greatest potential to be allocated (green) or at the very least it should be identified as an amber site.

This site is suitable for housing development, it would form an extension to the settlement of New Farnley and technical supporting reports have been prepared and submitted to the Council (detailed in the next section of this representation statement) which demonstrate there are no development constraints.

The NPPF, at paragraph 52, specifically supports extensions to existing villages and towns, advising the supply of new homes can sometimes be best achieved through planning for larger scale development through such extensions. The Wood End Farm site would result in a sustainable urban extension to New Farnley. The site is well located for access to employment opportunities in Leeds, lies on an existing bus route and is within easy walking distance of shops and services within the settlement, including a co-op foodstore, post office, two primary schools and a senior school.

On the basis of the evidence set out in this statement, it is maintained this site is one which has the greatest potential to be allocated and therefore the site should be identified as a green site, or at the very least, an amber site.

See representation submitted for full details

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3458

Housing

Wood End Farm, South of Whitehall Road, Farnley

Name: Wortlea Estates

Representor No: PRS05945

Representation ID: REP06711 Question Ref: H10

Site 3458

The Wood End Farm site has not been considered as a future allocation, it was sieved out of the assessment process. We consider the site should have been assessed and that the site was either removed in error as a result of the site being split between two housing market characteristic areas or as a result of the Council taking an inconsistent approach. This site should be considered as a future housing allocation.

The Council's assessment suggests the site is not within the settlement hierarchy. We do not support the Council's reasoning in relation to this site. The Wood End Farm site directly adjoins the settlement of New Farnley at its southern extent. The site lies to the south of Whitehall Road where there are residential dwellings to the north, east and west. It is therefore questioned how the Council can conclude the site is not within the settlement hierarchy, when the site sits adjacent to the settlement limits of New Farnley, which forms part of the Leeds Main Urban Area.

The Council's reasoning cannot be as a result of the site sitting outside, but adjoining the settlement limits, as the vast majority of sites assessed are ones which adjoin the existing built up settlement boundaries of Leeds and its outlying towns / villages.

Similarly, the site cannot have been ruled out because of it sitting to the south of Whitehall Road, not least because there are already residential dwellings on the southern side of Whitehall Road, but principally because the Council has assessed the sites at Harpers Farm, South of Whitehall Road (Ref: 1171A) and Craven Park (Ref: 2159), which sits to the south of the Harpers Farm site. These two sites are materially no different in locational terms to the Wood End Farm site. All of these sites sit to the south of Whitehall Road and would form an extension to the existing settlement limits of New Farnley. The Council has therefore been wholly inconsistent in their approach in sieving out the Wood End Farm site when the Harpers Farm and Craven Park sites were assessed.

A further example is the land at Whitehall Road, Gildersome (Ref: 3001). This site lies to the south west of the Wood End Farm site. In viewing this site on the Outer West map, it appears to bear no relation to any settlement, yet it has been assessed. This site also sits on the edge of the Outer West area, and it would seem the site has been promoted as an extension to the settlement of Gildersome, yet it does not directly adjoin the existing settlement boundary and as such the Council could have readily concluded this site is not within the settlement hierarchy and sieved it out, but this site was assessed.

There would appear to be no logical reason for the Council having concluded the site is not within the settlement hierarchy, given it lies adjacent to the settlement limits of New Farnley and would therefore form an extension to this settlement and in this regard it is no different to the vast number of urban extension sites the Council has assessed. It is considered the site could have only been 'sieved out' in error, as a result of the Council first reviewing the site in the context of its position on the Outer South West map without having reassessed its location in the context of the Outer West map.

As a result of the location of the Outer South West and Outer West housing characteristic market area boundaries, the site is split into two, with the northern part of the site lying within the Outer West area and the southern part of the site lying within the Outer West area. Viewing the site only in the context of the Outer South West area map, the site would appear to bear no relation to any settlement. It is therefore considered the site was sieved out on this basis, without the Council having identified the site extended further northwards with the northern boundary of the site directly adjoining the settlement of New Farnley. It is therefore considered the site was sieved out prior to it being assessed in the context of the Outer West Housing Area, where it directly adjoins an existing settlement.

If it is not the case the site has been removed in error, then it is maintained there is no justification for sieving out this site, given it directly adjoins New Farnley and particularly when considered in the context of the sites the Council has assessed.

On the basis of the evidence set out, it is maintained the Wood End Farm site should not have been sieved out and therefore the site should be assessed prior to the next consultation stage to enable its consideration as a suitable housing allocation which would enable the extension of New Farnley.

See representation submitted for full details

Representation ID: REP06711 Question Ref: H11

Site 3458

The Wood End Farm site (ref: 3458) should be developed in the short term. The site is deliverable in the short term as it is available now, it offers a suitable location for development now and is achievable, as there is a realistic prospect that housing can be delivered within five years.

Name: Jonathan Barrow

Representor No: PRS06088

Representation ID: REP06943 Question Ref: General comment

3458

1273

New Farnley's infrastructure cannot support any more new houses. The schools, doctors etc are already full, the roads cannot cope even now.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: Peter Ashton

Representor No: PRS00130

Representation ID: REP04606 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: Brian Guy

Representor No: PRS00142

Representation ID: REP04161 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that, those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Representation ID: REP04659 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: Kathleen Davis

Representor No: PRS00188

Representation ID: REP04521 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Wenda P Whitehead

Representor No: PRS00312

Representation ID: REP04786 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Name: Janice Beever

Representor No: PRS00441

Representation ID: REP04791 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: P S Barrie

Representor No: PRS00915

Representation ID: REP04810 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Representation ID: REP04781 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Representation ID: REP04769 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Name: Beverley Henry

Representor No: PRS01121

Representation ID: REP04165 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33
137B Britannia Road 87
141 Tingley Common 36
1018A Topcliffe lane 231
3077A Rein Road 246
3077B Rein Road 124
1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that,those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Lynne Paul

Representor No: PRS01169

Representation ID: REP04800 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: D Paul

Representor No: PRS01183

Representation ID: REP04793 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Representation ID: REP08289 Question Ref: H4

3467 -
The plans submitted are outside the original Inspector's recommendations yet these plans are being considered.
As with all the sites the whole seem to be invisible to this council. As to the access onto the A650 that is an accident waiting to happen.

Name: S Appleyard

Representor No: PRS01369

Representation ID: REP03492 Question Ref: H4

3467 - Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock. The problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be a need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

This site has had conditions place on it by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Name: Martin Proctor

Representor No: PRS01553

Representation ID: REP03696 Question Ref: H4

3467 Green to Red - Bruntcliffe road Morley. Should be shelved until infrastructure is improved. Only access is from the A650 which has major issues with traffic flow at peak times.

Name: B Stringer

Representor No: PRS01606

Representation ID: REP04797 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Name: L.e Beever

Representor No: PRS01607

Representation ID: REP04804 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: K Mason

Representor No: PRS01946

Representation ID: REP04096 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33
137B Britannia Road 87
141 Tingley Common 36
1018A Topcliffe lane 231
3077A Rein Road 246
3077B Rein Road 124
1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed firstit appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: P Coates

Representor No: PRS01948

Representation ID: REP04130 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33
137B Britannia Road 87
141 Tingley Common 36
1018A Topcliffe lane 231
3077A Rein Road 246
3077B Rein Road 124
1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed firstit appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: E Kamis

Representor No: PRS01961

Representation ID: REP04146 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that,those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: D Rigby

Representor No: PRS01971

Representation ID: REP04142 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that,those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: B Smith

Representor No: PRS01978

Representation ID: REP04622 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33
137B Britannia Road 87
141 Tingley Common 36
1018A Topcliffe lane 231
3077A Rein Road 246
3077B Rein Road 124
1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Representation ID: REP04174 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33
137B Britannia Road 87
141 Tingley Common 36
1018A Topcliffe lane 231
3077A Rein Road 246
3077B Rein Road 124
1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that,those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: M Webster

Representor No: PRS01980

Representation ID: REP04176 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that,those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: P Carter

Representor No: PRS01986

Representation ID: REP04178 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that,those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: D Carter

Representor No: PRS01992

Representation ID: REP04188 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that,those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: Elaine Carter

Representor No: PRS01998

Representation ID: REP04194 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that,those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: Robert Hall

Representor No: PRS02009

Representation ID: REP04208 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that,those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: Emma Price

Representor No: PRS02222

Representation ID: REP04456 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: J Cowie

Representor No: PRS02227

Representation ID: REP04768 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Representation ID: REP04458 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: James Mallinson

Representor No: PRS02229

Representation ID: REP04466 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: J Middleton

Representor No: PRS02231

Representation ID: REP04468 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: Barnes

Representor No: PRS02236

Representation ID: REP04471 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: Wormald

Representor No: PRS02238

Representation ID: REP04476 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: T White

Representor No: PRS02241

Representation ID: REP04479 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: Brian Dykes

Representor No: PRS02246

Representation ID: REP04482 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: Barrett

Representor No: PRS02248

Representation ID: REP04486 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: K Batley

Representor No: PRS02249

Representation ID: REP04487 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: M Farnhill

Representor No: PRS02261

Representation ID: REP04501 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: Sandra And Arthur Gawthorpe

Representor No: PRS02265

Representation ID: REP04504 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: P Batley

Representor No: PRS02269

Representation ID: REP04508 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: Ann Raistrick

Representor No: PRS02282

Representation ID: REP04524 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: L Leatherly

Representor No: PRS02285

Representation ID: REP04526 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: Helen Ainley

Representor No: PRS02288

Representation ID: REP04528 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: Susan Holt

Representor No: PRS02289

Representation ID: REP04772 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Representation ID: REP04532 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: Dereck Holt

Representor No: PRS02311

Representation ID: REP04766 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Representation ID: REP04555 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: S Pickering

Representor No: PRS02312

Representation ID: REP04557 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: Anne And Alan Britton

Representor No: PRS02313

Representation ID: REP04558 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: Helen Guy

Representor No: PRS02314

Representation ID: REP04559 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: R Platt

Representor No: PRS02316

Representation ID: REP04563 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: David Stott

Representor No: PRS02317

Representation ID: REP04565 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: S Roberts

Representor No: PRS02319

Representation ID: REP04567 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: M McNicholl

Representor No: PRS02321

Representation ID: REP04570 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: Jason Beecroft

Representor No: PRS02326

Representation ID: REP04573 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: Peter Newsome

Representor No: PRS02328

Representation ID: REP04577 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: Jenni Davenport

Representor No: PRS02330

Representation ID: REP04770 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Representation ID: REP04580 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: P Sutton

Representor No: PRS02333

Representation ID: REP04583 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: Stephen And Janice Duffy

Representor No: PRS02337

Representation ID: REP04586 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: A Glen

Representor No: PRS02338

Representation ID: REP04588 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: Frank Raven

Representor No: PRS02339

Representation ID: REP04771 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Representation ID: REP04589 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: Kudlip Kawz

Representor No: PRS02358

Representation ID: REP04607 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: Carole Deighton
Representor No: PRS02362

Representation ID: REP04613 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.
I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.
SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:
137A Britannia Road 33
137B Britannia Road 87
141 Tingley Common 36
1018A Topcliffe lane 231
3077A Rein Road 246
3077B Rein Road 124
1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16
The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: E Naylor

Representor No: PRS02363

Representation ID: REP04780 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Representation ID: REP04616 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: Ava D Platt

Representor No: PRS02370

Representation ID: REP04624 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: Kathleen Paver

Representor No: PRS02372

Representation ID: REP04774 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Representation ID: REP04626 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: Diane Taylor-reid

Representor No: PRS02374

Representation ID: REP04627 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: C Guy

Representor No: PRS02377

Representation ID: REP04767 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Representation ID: REP04630 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: Howard Boyce

Representor No: PRS02384

Representation ID: REP04641 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: J Beldon

Representor No: PRS02385

Representation ID: REP04642 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: A W Cooper

Representor No: PRS02387

Representation ID: REP04644 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: Luke Standage

Representor No: PRS02389

Representation ID: REP04646 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: K And C Morrison

Representor No: PRS02397

Representation ID: REP04655 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: C Clegg

Representor No: PRS02406

Representation ID: REP04663 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Name: Doreen Gill

Representor No: PRS02496

Representation ID: REP04755 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Name: D Naylor

Representor No: PRS02497

Representation ID: REP04773 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: A Paver

Representor No: PRS02498

Representation ID: REP04775 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South
Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Name: James Bowers

Representor No: PRS02500

Representation ID: REP04777 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South
Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Name: Alan Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02501

Representation ID: REP04778 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South
Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Name: Vivienne Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02502

Representation ID: REP04779 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South
Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Name: Vivian Oxtoby

Representor No: PRS02504

Representation ID: REP04783 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South
Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: G Oxtoby

Representor No: PRS02505

Representation ID: REP07814 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Beryl Hewitt

Representor No: PRS02506

Representation ID: REP04785 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Name: D A Clegg

Representor No: PRS02507

Representation ID: REP04788 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Name: Pauline Wood

Representor No: PRS02508

Representation ID: REP04790 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: Joyce Thompson

Representor No: PRS02510

Representation ID: REP04792 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Name: K Horner

Representor No: PRS02512

Representation ID: REP04789 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Patricia Aston

Representor No: PRS02513

Representation ID: REP04796 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: J W Crabtree

Representor No: PRS02514

Representation ID: REP04794 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: L. G Wilson

Representor No: PRS02515

Representation ID: REP04799 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Name: S Laurence

Representor No: PRS02517

Representation ID: REP04801 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Name: C Graham

Representor No: PRS02518

Representation ID: REP04803 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: M Allsop

Representor No: PRS02520

Representation ID: REP04805 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South
Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Name: R Hartill

Representor No: PRS02521

Representation ID: REP04806 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South
Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Name: Edith Holmes

Representor No: PRS02522

Representation ID: REP04808 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South
Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Name: Harry Holmes

Representor No: PRS02524

Representation ID: REP04811 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South
Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Name: Ann Morse

Representor No: PRS02526

Representation ID: REP04813 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South
Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Name: L.r Morse

Representor No: PRS02527

Representation ID: REP04816 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South
Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: Harry Vasey

Representor No: PRS02529

Representation ID: REP07823 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: B F Thompson

Representor No: PRS02531

Representation ID: REP04814 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: Charles Ollis

Representor No: PRS02532

Representation ID: REP04820 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: S Gamble

Representor No: PRS02535

Representation ID: REP04821 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Michael Hartill

Representor No: PRS02556

Representation ID: REP04847 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Name: Jim Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02561

Representation ID: REP04852 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Name: Helen Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02562

Representation ID: REP04855 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: Jonathan Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02563

Representation ID: REP07833 Question Ref: H4

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

137A Britannia Road 33

137B Britannia Road 87

141 Tingley Common 36

1018A Topcliffe lane 231

3077A Rein Road 246

3077B Rein Road 124

1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234

1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11

3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Ronald Gill

Representor No: PRS02564

Representation ID: REP04858 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Name: A.w Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02565

Representation ID: REP04859 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Name: J Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02566

Representation ID: REP04860 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: Norman Dearden

Representor No: PRS02568

Representation ID: REP04857 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green to replace Green sites in Outer South West. 3467 Bruntcliffe Rd, Capacity 16, Ward Morley South Adjacent to a proposed development recently and controversially given outline permission. Infrastructure and access to the A650 are major concerns regarding such a development.

Name: S. R Searle

Representor No: PRS02649

Representation ID: REP05094 Question Ref: H4

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Angela Mallinson

Representor No: PRS02650

Representation ID: REP05095 Question Ref: H4

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Stuart Perkins Kendell

Representor No: PRS04909

Representation ID: REP01206 Question Ref: H4

341 and 3467 These areas should be looked at before areas such as the ones objected to.

Name: Neil Dawson

Representor No: PRS05884

Representation ID: REP06563 Question Ref: General comment

Potential Education and School sites

The increased level of housing demand will put pressure on schools to accommodate more pupils and therefore there should be some consideration of potential sites for new or extensions to existing schools to ensure there is sufficient capacity for the increased number of children expected to attend schools.

Some initial suggestions are as follows;

Sites 1064A, 3467. These sites are in the Morley urban area with suggested employment use but these may be suitable sites for a new primary school particularly if other housing developments proceed in the Bruntcliffe area.

The PAS site, 2127, at Tingley Station is a large development which along with other developments on nearby on Thorpe Lane is of such a size that it should potentially include a primary school site within or nearby.

At the existing Bruntcliffe School there is some potential to expand at the rear of the current site to either expand the existing school or provide primary provision.

Site 1166 which is adjacent to the existing school at Asquith could be utilized for expansion of the school.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H4

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Amber Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H4

Agree with amber allocation

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H4

Site 3467 - Must be co-ordinated with sites nearby and boundaries which should be drawn to reflect the recent Planning permission granted to Barratt Homes and the associated Sec 106 buffer-strip agreement. Remain amber.

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: General comment

There is particular difficulty with a group of sites on Bruntcliffe Road. A recent planning permission caused some confusion by deviating from UDP allocation boundaries; the boundaries, capacities and colour codes need sorting out. This group is made up of LDF sites 1064A red, 1064B green, 1281A lime green, 1281B green and 3467 amber. We have left these untouched.

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H4

Agree with amber allocation

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H4

Site 3467 - Must be co-ordinated with sites nearby and boundaries which should be drawn to reflect the recent Planning permission granted to Barratt Homes and the associated Sec 106 buffer-strip agreement. Remain amber.

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: General comment

There is particular difficulty with a group of sites on Bruntcliffe Road. A recent planning permission caused some confusion by deviating from UDP allocation boundaries; the boundaries, capacities and colour codes need sorting out. This group is made up of LDF sites 1064A red, 1064B green, 1281A lime green, 1281B green and 3467 amber. We have left these untouched.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 3467

Housing

Bruntcliffe Road

Name: Unidentifiable

Representor No: PRS99999

Representation ID: REP04628 Question Ref: H1

It seems a great deal of money and time has been spent on producing long documents for future development without giving any thought to how the infrastructure is going to cope which is already struggling.

I refer to these following residential sites and possible housing sites.

SITE REF. ADDRESS CAPACITY:

- 137A Britannia Road 33
- 137B Britannia Road 87
- 141 Tingley Common 36
- 1018A Topcliffe lane 231
- 3077A Rein Road 246
- 3077B Rein Road 124
- 1281B Bruntcliffe Road 234
- 1064B Bruntcliffe Road 11
- 3467 Bruntcliffe Road 16

The last three sites have had conditions placed on them by a government inspector that was hard fought for and we strongly feel that those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all of these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unexceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock,the problems we have on the A650 are well documentated. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate,health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. ,Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses,offices etc.VVhile there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communties. Brownfield sites such asTingley Mills,land at the bottom of High Street,Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds,just to name a few should be developed first. It appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 4002

Housing

Park Lees site, St Anthony's Road, Beeston

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 4 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' and 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network.

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network)

From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service frequency levels.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites - green sites are linked to this comment]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H1

Agree with green allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H1

Agree with green allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 4004

Housing

Thorpe Hill Farm, Lingwell Gate Lane, Thorpe

Name: Brian Guy

Representor No: PRS00142

Representation ID: REP04659 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: Wenda P Whitehead

Representor No: PRS00312

Representation ID: REP04786 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: Janice Beever

Representor No: PRS00441

Representation ID: REP04791 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: P S Barrie

Representor No: PRS00915

Representation ID: REP04810 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Representation ID: REP04769 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Representation ID: REP04781 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: Lynne Paul

Representor No: PRS01169

Representation ID: REP04800 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: D Paul

Representor No: PRS01183

Representation ID: REP04793 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: B Stringer

Representor No: PRS01606

Representation ID: REP04797 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 4004

Housing

Thorpe Hill Farm, Lingwell Gate Lane, Thorpe

Name: L.e Beever

Representor No: PRS01607

Representation ID: REP04804 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: J Cowie

Representor No: PRS02227

Representation ID: REP04768 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: Susan Holt

Representor No: PRS02289

Representation ID: REP04772 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: Dereck Holt

Representor No: PRS02311

Representation ID: REP04766 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: Jenni Davenport

Representor No: PRS02330

Representation ID: REP04770 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: Frank Raven

Representor No: PRS02339

Representation ID: REP04771 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: E Naylor

Representor No: PRS02363

Representation ID: REP04780 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: Kathleen Paver

Representor No: PRS02372

Representation ID: REP04774 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 4004

Housing

Thorpe Hill Farm, Lingwell Gate Lane, Thorpe

Name: C Guy

Representor No: PRS02377

Representation ID: REP04767 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: C Clegg

Representor No: PRS02406

Representation ID: REP04663 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: Doreen Gill

Representor No: PRS02496

Representation ID: REP04755 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: D Naylor

Representor No: PRS02497

Representation ID: REP04773 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: A Paver

Representor No: PRS02498

Representation ID: REP04775 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: James Bowers

Representor No: PRS02500

Representation ID: REP04777 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: Alan Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02501

Representation ID: REP04778 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: Vivienne Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02502

Representation ID: REP04779 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 4004

Housing

Thorpe Hill Farm, Lingwell Gate Lane, Thorpe

Name: Vivian Oxtoby

Representor No: PRS02504

Representation ID: REP04783 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: Beryl Hewitt

Representor No: PRS02506

Representation ID: REP04785 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: D A Clegg

Representor No: PRS02507

Representation ID: REP04788 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: Pauline Wood

Representor No: PRS02508

Representation ID: REP04790 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: Joyce Thompson

Representor No: PRS02510

Representation ID: REP04792 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: Patricia Aston

Representor No: PRS02513

Representation ID: REP04796 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: L. G Wilson

Representor No: PRS02515

Representation ID: REP04799 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: S Laurence

Representor No: PRS02517

Representation ID: REP04801 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 4004

Housing

Thorpe Hill Farm, Lingwell Gate Lane, Thorpe

Name: C Graham

Representor No: PRS02518

Representation ID: REP04803 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: M Allsop

Representor No: PRS02520

Representation ID: REP04805 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: R Hartill

Representor No: PRS02521

Representation ID: REP04806 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: Edith Holmes

Representor No: PRS02522

Representation ID: REP04808 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: Harry Holmes

Representor No: PRS02524

Representation ID: REP04811 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: Ann Morse

Representor No: PRS02526

Representation ID: REP04813 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: L.r Morse

Representor No: PRS02527

Representation ID: REP04816 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: Michael Hartill

Representor No: PRS02556

Representation ID: REP04847 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 4004

Housing

Thorpe Hill Farm, Lingwell Gate Lane, Thorpe

Name: Jim Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02561

Representation ID: REP04852 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: Helen Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02562

Representation ID: REP04855 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: Ronald Gill

Representor No: PRS02564

Representation ID: REP04858 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: A.w Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02565

Representation ID: REP04859 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: J Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02566

Representation ID: REP04860 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: Norman Dearden

Representor No: PRS02568

Representation ID: REP04857 Question Ref: H4

Change from Amber to Green. 4004 Thorpe Hill Farm, Capacity 57, Ward Ardsley & Robin Hood
Would fit with a small cluster of other developments but is in use for employment.

Name: Richard Marshall

Representor No: PRS03170

Representation ID: REP01024 Question Ref: H4

2098C, 2105, 2155, 3000, 3056,3064, 3078A, 4004, and 4029. As previously stated the amber sites that are greenbelt land should not be considered for development.

Representation ID: REP01024 Question Ref: H5

1079, 1072, 1077, 1143B, 1143D, 1171B, 1200A, 1258, 1284a, 1285, 1344, 2098a, 3365, 3456A.2098C, 2105, 2155, 3000, 3056,3064, 3078A, 4004, and 4029. As previously stated the amber sites that are greenbelt land should not be considered for development. Site 1032 is designated as a protected area of search this land has been retained along the edge of the existing settlement pending more suitable sites being found in the longer term this site should only be developed as a last resort.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 4004

Housing

Thorpe Hill Farm, Lingwell Gate Lane, Thorpe

Name: Lisa Mulherin

Representor No: PRS05734

Representation ID: REP07126 Question Ref: H4

4004 Thorpe Hill Farm – This site is also supposedly Green Belt but is in industrial use. This site could potentially be used for housing in the future. I support the amber designation.

Name: Neil Dawson

Representor No: PRS05884

Representation ID: REP06563 Question Ref: H4

Suggested sites from Amber to Red;

- 309
- 1067B
- 1069
- 1143F
- 1220A
- 1274
- 1275A
- 1279
- 1332
- 2105
- 2155
- 3000
- 3064
- 3078A
- 4004

These sites are almost all located within the existing Green Belt and expansion into the Green Belt would lead to increased urban sprawl between the various townships in the Outer South West, and lead to coalescence between communities

Development of the Green Belt sites would also reduce the open green area and provide encroachment into the countryside around Morley and other smaller townships.

In addition there is insufficient road capacity and little scope for expansion for other necessary services. There would be a requirement for new or upgrading of existing roads which would therefore favour development on sites that are already located within the Morley or the Leeds Urban areas rather than eroding the Green Belt further.

Site 3078A is close to potential development in Kirklees and could lead to the complete erosion of the Green Belt and open green space between Leeds and Kirklees.

Any further development at sites 1275A and 1279 would reduce the Green Belt between the existing residential boundary and the A653 Dewsbury Road to a narrow strip which would put pressure in future years to extend residential use further east.

See rep for full details.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 4004

Housing

Thorpe Hill Farm, Lingwell Gate Lane, Thorpe

Name: Simmons

Representor No: PRS05938

Representation ID: REP06707 Question Ref: H4

An initial submission was made by email on 27 September 2012 which included the Site Proposal Form, Site Ownership Plan, Annotated Photographs and Site Opportunities & Constraints Plan. The Site Allocations Plan Volume 2: 10 Outer South West issued in June 2013 identified the site (reference 4004) with an Amber coding (sites which have potential but there may be issues which need to be resolved, or the site may not be in such a favoured location as those highlighted in Green). The Conclusion of Assessment stated:

'Green Belt site, surrounded by development, well contained and has a road frontage. However, the site is in existing employment use'

Given the above assessment of the site and subsequent discussions with a planning officer at the consultation event at Pudsey Centre on 25 June 2013, the primary issue relating to the allocation of the site for residential use in the forthcoming Site Allocations Plan is the loss of employment land.

The current planning policy relating to the loss of employment land within Leeds City Council's Unitary Development Plan (adopted 19 July 2006) is policy E7, which states:

'With the exceptions of residential development on land no longer needed for employment use and of ancillary development supporting employment uses on the proposal site, applications for uses outside the B use classes will not be permitted on land identified for employment purposes under policies E3 and E4, and on land or for premises currently or last in employment use, unless all the following criteria can be met:

(i) the site is not reserved for specific types of employment use under policies E8 and E18

Although the site is not identified for employment use under policies E3 or E4, it is currently in employment use. An assessment of the criteria detailed above and on the previous page is therefore required in order to demonstrate that there is no planning need for the site to be retained in employment use and an allocation for residential use can proceed.

Representation ID: REP06707 Question Ref: H4

(iii) With regard to the local area, there are two sites in close proximity to the proposed site that were previously allocated for employment use under the Employment Land Review (2010 Update):

o Former Brick Works, Lingwell Gate Lane, Thorpe (site reference 2201920 / 2201921)

Part of the site already has full planning permission for housing and is being developed. The remaining part was previously allocated for employment use under Policy E4 (40) for industrial and warehousing development, although this allocation is proposed to be removed under the Site Allocations Plan and replaced with a housing allocation for 54 units (site reference 148 – Green coding)

o Thorpe Hall, Thorpe Lane, Thorpe (site reference 2201930)

The site was previously allocated for employment use under Policy E4 (41) for office development, although the site this allocation is proposed to be removed under the Site Allocations Plan and would potentially be replaced with a housing allocation for 70 units (site reference 309 – Amber coding)

With regard to employment land availability being promoted by the Site Allocations Plan, there are a number of employment sites with existing planning permissions and allocations within 2.5 miles (4km) of the site at Capitol Park in Tingley and within the Aire Valley Leeds Area Action Plan. Both of these areas provide greatly improved infrastructure, accessibility and a wide range of employment uses when compared to the proposed site

Representation ID: REP06707 Question Ref: H4

(iv) The proposed allocation for residential use would not result in environmental, amenity or traffic problems. The site is in close proximity to the settlement of Thorpe-on-the-Hill and

meets all of the relevant standards for primary / secondary education and primary health needs. The proposed residential use would also result in improved environmental and amenity standards for the existing settlement, the recent residential developments in close proximity to the site and the proposed re-allocation of the two adjacent sites from employment to housing use. The site has bus stops in close proximity (within 125m), and although it has access to only two buses per hour the A61 is located less than 1km from the site which provides excellent bus access to Leeds, Wakefield and beyond. The site has an existing vehicular access from Lingwell Gate Lane which would adequately serve the indicative number of proposed dwellings (57) with appropriate access width and visibility already in place. With regard to the local traffic network, Leeds City Council Highways confirmed that spare capacity onto the main highway network is available although there may be cumulative issues with the adjacent sites being put forward for residential use - a matter that would need to be addressed sequentially as each site is developed

Representation ID: REP06707 Question Ref: H4

The associated planning policy within the emerging Core Strategy of the Local Development Framework is policy EC3 (Safeguarding Existing Employment Land and Industrial Areas), which states:

'The Employment Land Review identifies the following local sub areas - Inner North East, Inner North West, Inner West, Outer North West and Outer North East where there are currently shortfalls in employment land provision.

Development of sites for non-employment uses, which were last used or allocated for employment will only be permitted where;

(i) The proposal would not result in the loss of a deliverable employment site necessary to meet the employment needs during the plan period ('employment needs' as identified in Spatial Policies 8 & 9); and

(ii) The loss of the employment provision on the site can be mitigated by the availability of identified sites in the 'surrounding area which are suitable to meeting the needs of employment ('surrounding area will be defined by drive time and public transport accessibility in Policy T2); and

(iii) In areas of shortfall, the proposal will deliver a mixed use development which continues to provide for a good range of local employment opportunities and would not undermine the viability of the remaining employment site.'

An assessment of criteria (i) and (ii) were made on the previous page during the assessment of the relevant UDP policy. Criteria (iii) does not apply as the site is not located within any of the sub areas with identified shortfalls in employment land provision.

We hope that the above detailed justification will allow the site at Thorpe Hill Farm, Lingwell Gate Lane, Thorpe to be allocated for housing in the forthcoming Site Allocations Plan.

Should any further information, details or justification be required, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 4004

Housing

Thorpe Hill Farm, Lingwell Gate Lane, Thorpe

Name: Simmons

Representor No: PRS05938

Representation ID: REP06707 Question Ref: H4

(ii) The Site Allocations Plan Issues and Options identify a wide range of sites that are suitable for employment use and that currently have undeveloped planning permissions and allocations to meet the identified requirements in the Core Strategy plan period (2012 – 2028). Given the area of the site (2.17 hectares), the proposed loss of industrial, business and warehousing use will not have a prejudicial impact on the achievement of the Core Strategy requirements

Representation ID: REP06707 Question Ref: H4

(i) The site is not reserved for specific types of employment use under policies E8 or E181

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H4

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Amber Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H4

Disagree with Council's amber assessment, think the site should be red

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H4

Disagree with Council's amber assessment, think the site should be red

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 4028

Housing

Thorpe Road, Middleton

Name: Mark Mills

Representor No: PRS06341

Representation ID: REP07302 Question Ref: H1

4028 – Thorpe RoadSupport allocation of site for housing – planning consent already secured for site and currently being delivered.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 4 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' and 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network.

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network)

From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service frequency levels.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites - green sites are linked to this comment]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H1

Agree with green allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H1

Agree with green allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 4029

Housing

Ravells Works, Whitehall Road

Name: Richard Marshall

Representor No: PRS03170

Representation ID: REP01024 Question Ref: H4

2098C, 2105, 2155, 3000, 3056,3064, 3078A, 4004, and 4029. As previously stated the amber sites that are greenbelt land should not be considered for development.

Representation ID: REP01024 Question Ref: H5

1079, 1072, 1077, 1143B, 1143D, 1171B, 1200A, 1258, 1284a, 1285, 1344, 2098a, 3365, 3456A.2098C, 2105, 2155, 3000, 3056,3064, 3078A, 4004, and 4029. As previously stated the amber sites that are greenbelt land should not be considered for development. Site 1032 is designated as a protected area of search this land has been retained along the edge of the existing settlement pending more suitable sites being found in the longer term this site should only be developed as a last resort.

Name: Neil Dawson

Representor No: PRS05884

Representation ID: REP06563 Question Ref: H4

The current number of sites required in the Outer South West is 7,200 and not withstanding my comments above on the overall numbers I would suggest the following changes to site allocations.

The total green and amber housing sites allocated in Outer South West is 9,653 whereas the plan is seeking 5,586 residential units. 1,614 housing units already have planning permission. There is therefore scope to increase the number of housing sites allocated as Red which are therefore not considered suitable for housing allocation.

There are two underlying reasons for revising the allocation of sites from Green and Amber to Red.

Firstly to protect the existing Green Belt around Morley and the Green Belt around smaller settlements in the Outer South West. In particular to restrict the sprawl of large built up areas and to prevent Morley and smaller settlements from merging to existing townships.

Secondly in my submission to the LDF in April 2012 I identified the Beeston Royds area in Outer South West as an area suitable for further significant housing development. This area is on the edge of the main urban area of Leeds. It has very good existing road links (the A61, A58 and the A6110) and it is close to the M621/M62.

There is a mixture of employment and residential use in the area and careful planning in the area should allow both employment and residential developments to take place for the duration of the plan.

Suggested sites to move from Amber to Green;

141
2078
3056
3386
4029

Site 141 is currently in employment use but is a brownfield site and as such should be considered for residential development ahead of other potential Greenfield sites.

The sites 3056, 2078, 4029 and 3386 are located in the Beeston Royds area in Farnley and Wortley ward and should be considered for residential development.

These sites could link with existing development in the area which is part of the main Leeds urban area. These developments will require a new road linking Gelderd Road and Whitehall Road but given the number of housing units this should be economically viable. The area would then have good access to the existing road network, at the Leeds Outer Ring Road and the M621/M62. It is close to retail facilities at Junction One, the White Rose Centre plus local shops in Lower Wortley. There is also potential for primary school development in the area if the total number of sites is expanded.

See rep for full details

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 4029

Housing

Ravells Works, Whitehall Road

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H4

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Amber Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are be minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H4

Disagree with Council's amber assessment, think the site should be red

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H4

Site 4029 - Needs to be red to protect employment. Amber to red.

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H4

Disagree with Council's amber assessment, think the site should be red

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H4

Site 4029 - Needs to be red to protect employment. Amber to red.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 4030

Housing

Thorpe Road, Thorpe Crescent, Middleton

Name: Mark Mills

Representor No: PRS06341

Representation ID: REP07302 Question Ref: H1

4030 – Thorpe Road / Thorpe Crescent Support allocation of site for housing – planning consent already secured for site and currently being delivered.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 1 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if these sites would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. Significant developer contributions will be required at these sites to improve the public transport to meet the council LDF accessibility policies; particularly in the larger sites should these be brought forward for development. These include SHLAA ref: 2062, 1032, 1046, 1017 & 1055.

Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small sites low capacity are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

The table also includes accessibility assessments results to access other services and facilities within acceptable journey times on public transport.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H1

Agree with green allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H1

Agree with green allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 4031

Housing

Thorpe Road, Thorpe Crescent, Thorpe View, Middleton

Name: Mark Mills

Representor No: PRS06341

Representation ID: REP07302 Question Ref: H1

4031 – Thorpe Road / Thorpe Crescent/ Thorpe WaySupport allocation of site for housing.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 1 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if these sites would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. Significant developer contributions will be required at these sites to improve the public transport to meet the council LDF accessibility policies; particularly in the larger sites should these be brought forward for development. These include SHLAA ref: 2062, 1032, 1046, 1017 & 1055.

Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small sites low capacity are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

The table also includes accessibility assessments results to access other services and facilities within acceptable journey times on public transport.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H1

Agree with green allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H1

Agree with green allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 4032

Housing

Thorpe Road, Thorpe Square, Middleton

Name: Mark Mills

Representor No: PRS06341

Representation ID: REP07302 Question Ref: H1

4032 – Thorpe SquareSupport allocation of site for housing.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 1 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if these sites would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. Significant developer contributions will be required at these sites to improve the public transport to meet the council LDF accessibility policies; particularly in the larger sites should these be brought forward for development. These include SHLAA ref: 2062, 1032, 1046, 1017 & 1055.

Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small sites low capacity are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

The table also includes accessibility assessments results to access other services and facilities within acceptable journey times on public transport.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H1

Agree with green allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H1

Agree with green allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 4033

Housing

Throstle Crescent, Middleton

Name: Mark Mills

Representor No: PRS06341

Representation ID: REP07302 Question Ref: H1

4033 – Throstle Road / Throstle TerraceSupport allocation of site for housing. It should be noted that this is a cleared housing site.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 1 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if these sites would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. Significant developer contributions will be required at these sites to improve the public transport to meet the council LDF accessibility policies; particularly in the larger sites should these be brought forward for development. These include SHLAA ref: 2062, 1032, 1046, 1017 & 1055.

Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small sites low capacity are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

The table also includes accessibility assessments results to access other services and facilities within acceptable journey times on public transport.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H1

Agree with green allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H1

Agree with green allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 4034

Housing

Acre Road, Sissons Drive, Middleton

Name: Mark Mills

Representor No: PRS06341

Representation ID: REP07302 Question Ref: H1

4034 – Sissons Drive / Sissons RoadSupport allocation of site for housing.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 4 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' and 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network.

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network)

From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service frequency levels.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites - green sites are linked to this comment]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H1

Agree with green allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H1

Agree with green allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 4035

Housing

Throstle Mount, Middleton

Name: Mark Mills

Representor No: PRS06341

Representation ID: REP07302 Question Ref: H1

4035 – Throstle MountSupport allocation of site for housin

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 4 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' and 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network.

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network)

From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service frequency levels.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites - green sites are linked to this comment]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H1

Agree with green allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H1

Agree with green allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 4052

Housing

Syke Road, Woodkirk

Name: Michael Green

Representor No: PRS00053

Representation ID: REP00459 Question Ref: H1

Support redevelopment for housing.

Representation ID: REP00459 Question Ref: H11

Short term - this is a classic example of a previously developed site which should be a priority for re-use.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 4 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' and 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network.

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network)

From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service frequency levels.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites - green sites are linked to this comment]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H1

Agree with green allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H1

Agree with green allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 4053

Housing

Joseph Priestly College

Name: Martin Proctor

Representor No: PRS01553

Representation ID: REP03696 Question Ref: H1

4053 Green to Brown [there is no brown colour code]. The Morley infrastructure needs improving first ok in principle but schools/doctors/ dentists etc need improving first.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 4 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' and 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network.

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network)

From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service frequency levels.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites - green sites are linked to this comment]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H1

Agree with green allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H1

Agree with green allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 4054

Housing

Peel Street Centre

Name: Brian Guy

Representor No: PRS00142

Representation ID: REP04659 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Wenda P Whitehead

Representor No: PRS00312

Representation ID: REP04786 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Janice Beever

Representor No: PRS00441

Representation ID: REP04791 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: P S Barrie

Representor No: PRS00915

Representation ID: REP04810 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Representation ID: REP04781 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Representation ID: REP04769 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Lynne Paul

Representor No: PRS01169

Representation ID: REP04800 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: D Paul

Representor No: PRS01183

Representation ID: REP04793 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: B Stringer

Representor No: PRS01606

Representation ID: REP04797 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 4054

Housing

Peel Street Centre

Name: L.e Beever

Representor No: PRS01607

Representation ID: REP04804 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: J Cowie

Representor No: PRS02227

Representation ID: REP04768 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Susan Holt

Representor No: PRS02289

Representation ID: REP04772 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Dereck Holt

Representor No: PRS02311

Representation ID: REP04766 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Jenni Davenport

Representor No: PRS02330

Representation ID: REP04770 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Frank Raven

Representor No: PRS02339

Representation ID: REP04771 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: E Naylor

Representor No: PRS02363

Representation ID: REP04780 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Kathleen Paver

Representor No: PRS02372

Representation ID: REP04774 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 4054

Housing

Peel Street Centre

Name: C Guy

Representor No: PRS02377

Representation ID: REP04767 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: C Clegg

Representor No: PRS02406

Representation ID: REP04663 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Doreen Gill

Representor No: PRS02496

Representation ID: REP04755 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: D Naylor

Representor No: PRS02497

Representation ID: REP04773 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: A Paver

Representor No: PRS02498

Representation ID: REP04775 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: James Bowers

Representor No: PRS02500

Representation ID: REP04777 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Alan Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02501

Representation ID: REP04778 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Vivienne Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02502

Representation ID: REP04779 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 4054

Housing

Peel Street Centre

Name: Vivian Oxtoby

Representor No: PRS02504

Representation ID: REP04783 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Beryl Hewitt

Representor No: PRS02506

Representation ID: REP04785 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: D A Clegg

Representor No: PRS02507

Representation ID: REP04788 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Pauline Wood

Representor No: PRS02508

Representation ID: REP04790 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Joyce Thompson

Representor No: PRS02510

Representation ID: REP04792 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Patricia Aston

Representor No: PRS02513

Representation ID: REP04796 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: L. G Wilson

Representor No: PRS02515

Representation ID: REP04799 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: S Laurence

Representor No: PRS02517

Representation ID: REP04801 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 4054

Housing

Peel Street Centre

Name: C Graham

Representor No: PRS02518

Representation ID: REP04803 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: M Allsop

Representor No: PRS02520

Representation ID: REP04805 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: R Hartill

Representor No: PRS02521

Representation ID: REP04806 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Edith Holmes

Representor No: PRS02522

Representation ID: REP04808 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Harry Holmes

Representor No: PRS02524

Representation ID: REP04811 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Ann Morse

Representor No: PRS02526

Representation ID: REP04813 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: L.r Morse

Representor No: PRS02527

Representation ID: REP04816 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Michael Hartill

Representor No: PRS02556

Representation ID: REP04847 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 4054

Housing

Peel Street Centre

Name: Jim Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02561

Representation ID: REP04852 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Helen Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02562

Representation ID: REP04855 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Ronald Gill

Representor No: PRS02564

Representation ID: REP04858 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: A.w Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02565

Representation ID: REP04859 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: J Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02566

Representation ID: REP04860 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Name: Norman Dearden

Representor No: PRS02568

Representation ID: REP04857 Question Ref: H14

Site ref 3003 Spring Gardens, could be considered as the area is adjacent to a local centre for facilities. Site ref 4054 Melbourne Street, could be considered for similar reasons. Site ref 3378 Geldard Road could be considered for similar reasons.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 4054

Housing

Peel Street Centre

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 4 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' and 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network.

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network)

From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service frequency levels.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites - green sites are linked to this comment]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H1

Agree with green allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H1

Agree with green allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: TLC002

Retail

Drighlington Local Centre

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP08047 Question Ref: R1

At Leeds consultation document para 10.2.1 we note and support the proposals for new local retail centres at Drighlington and East Ardsley.

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08219 Question Ref: R1

At Leeds consultation document para 10.2.1 we note and support the proposals for new local retail centres at Drighlington and East Ardsley. We also support the reduction in the size of Morley town centre; those parts deleted seem to have lost retailing by natural attrition, so the change does little more than reflect reality. The Tommy Wass lower order local centre is a reasonable designation of shops around a suburban cross roads on the A653 Dewsbury Road as it enters Leeds proper, though it might be suspected that one day there will be a call for demolitions to allow a new crossroads to be laid out. Proposed extensions CFSMO I 9 and CFSM023 are reasonable in themselves and might replace floorspace lost in any crossroads alterations.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: TLC003

Retail

Tommy Wass (Dewsbury Road) Local Centre

Name: Bizspace

Representor No: PRS05122

Representation ID: REP07752 Question Ref: R1

Tommy Wass centre

My client wishes to support the retail overview, particularly section 7.1 which focuses retail development in existing centres and within new boundaries identified to accommodate additional retail development. We specifically note the intention to allocate a new centre at Tommy Wass in Map 3 'Hierarchy of Centres - Town and Local Centre Designations', which is fully commended and we consider that this is a suitable and sustainable approach, securing and building upon the existing facilities in the local area. Moreover, this helps to provide shopping and other town centre uses needs near to where the local population live and work and reduces the need to travel. Which meets with the aims and policy requirements of the NPPF and Core Strategy.

See rep for full details.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: TLC003

Retail

Tommy Wass (Dewsbury Road) Local Centre

Name: Bizspace

Representor No: PRS05122

Representation ID: REP05698 Question Ref: R1

This representation is prepared on behalf of our client Bizspace with reference to their site, Sugar Mill, located off Dewsbury Road, to the south-west of the Leeds City Centre. A copy of a site and location plan is attached which confirms the boundaries of the site within my client's ownership. This letter should be considered as a representation to the Site Allocations Development Plan Document, Issues and Options Paper.

Volume 1: Plan Overview

Retail Overview

My client wishes to support the retail overview, particularly section 7.1 which focuses retail development in existing centres and within new boundaries identified to accommodate additional retail development. We specifically note the intention to allocate a new centre at Tommy Wass in Map 3 'Hierarchy of Centres - Town and Local Centre Designations', which is fully commended and we consider that this is a suitable and sustainable approach, securing and building upon the existing facilities in the local area. Moreover, this helps to provide shopping and other town centre uses needs near to where the local population live and work and reduces the need to travel. Which meets with the aims and policy requirements of the NPPF and Core Strategy. Sections 7.9 - 7.11 advises that some of the centres have nearby opportunities for new retail development and, where these exist, have been identified. It also states that, where retail is related to the centre, that the boundary will be revised, where possible. In Volume 2 the southerly part of our client's site, fronting Dewsbury Road is one such opportunity which has been identified adjacent to the Tommy Wass proposed centre. We consider that 1 acre of the site, fronting Dewsbury Road is a suitable retail opportunity which exists directly adjacent to the proposed centre (and notwithstanding that the use is already a 'town centre use', offices, and could be included on that basis) should be included within the boundary as a retail opportunity site. It is not physically detached from the centre in any way and we do not consider that there is any reason why it should not form part of this new centre. Indeed, should the retail opportunity be realised at this site, this would help re-enforce and consolidate the new centre and regenerate an underused site. Furthermore, the allocation of the site meets with the core planning principles identified in the NPPF, particularly in proactively driving and supporting sustainable economic development to deliver a thriving local place, responding positively to opportunities for growth and delivering missed use developments on brownfield sites.

In these terms, we support the proposal to amend the centre boundaries to take account of opportunity sites where these relate to a centre. We respectfully request that this approach is applied to our client's site and that the boundary is extended to include 1 acre at the front of our client's site, as forming part of the Tommy Wass centre.

Housing Overview

We acknowledge and support the approach taken to sieve out unsuitable sites and, thereafter, to undertake a detailed assessment of the suitability of each site, resulting in a traffic light system to identify the sites with the greatest potential to be allocated for housing. Our client's site was identified as a 'green' site therefore, a site with the greatest potential to be allocated for housing. We agree that our client's site should be green but do not consider that the assessment fully addresses cumulative benefits when developed alongside adjacent sites. The housing strategy only appears to consider the housing allocation (and indeed the retail opportunity to the front of my client's site) individually, rather than as composite parts of a significant regeneration development for Tommy Wass. In these terms we consider that the housing strategy should look closely at promoting 'green' sites adjacent to other development sites which will afford a wider regeneration effect and should therefore be identified as a priority development site for residential, developable in the short term.

No consideration seems to have been given to the existing character of the surrounding area. My client's site is located directly adjacent to and would maintain the character of an established residential area. Moreover, it would create less conflict than the existing use. Appropriate design could also help improve links through the site, for the existing residential population, allowing easier access to the Tommy Wass centre and public transportation system.

Under the new permitted development rights this part of the site may benefit from conversion of the offices to housing and therefore, an allocation would allow developers to consider the most appropriate form and density of residential development, rather than depending solely on conversion of the existing building.

Volume 2: 10 Outer South West

Outer South West Retail Issues and Options

We support the inclusion of the Tommy Wass as a new proposed centre, but note that the boundary on Plan 10.2 extends directly to the west of our client's site, but does not include it. However, within table 10.2.4 the comments section confirms that the site, reference: CFSM019, is already located in the centre and that retail is acceptable, pending other planning consideration. We respectfully request that given the existing office use of the site and confirmation that the site represents a suitable retail opportunity site, that the section fronting Dewsbury Road is included within the centre boundary as it appears that it's exclusion from the boundary is an error, as it is inconsistent with table 10.2.4. With no other sites within the Tommy Wass boundary, there is little, or no, further opportunity to promote further investment in the centre. Accordingly, our client's site represents the only sustainable allocation to allow any potential future needs of the local area to be met within the plan period. Furthermore, we agree and support the Council's assessment of sites under 10.2.4, that our client's site represents the most sequentially preferable site put forward under the call for sites exercise and therefore meets with the requirements of the NPPF and Core Strategy, which seek to promote a centre first strategy. We support the proposed allocation of the front part of the site for retail, as part of a wider mixed use development.

Outer South West Housing Issues and Options

We support the approach taken by the Council to sieve out sites which have been removed from further consideration, as per page 17 Volume 1.

We support the categorisation of the remaining pool of sites into a traffic light system, and agree with the assessment that the Sugar Mill site, reference 3394 should be coded 'green' (meaning a site which has the greatest potential to be allocated for housing). Moreover, table 10.3.3 confirms that our client's site is a brownfield site within the urban area, suitable for residential use in principle. It should be noted that this forms part of a wider mixed use proposal which would include a comprehensive development of retail to the front and would retain an element of employment. This mixed use development would secure investment towards the newly allocated Tommy Wass centre and would help secure its vitality and viability. We consider that the sites identified as 'green' represent the most suitable sites to consider allocating for future housing development. On the basis of the assessment questions against which each site has been assessed, the green sites represent the most sustainable proposals, which will deliver the greatest benefits to new residents and the surrounding community. These sites experience fewer, if any, constraints and therefore offer the most realistic and viable option for development over the plan period and their allocation should be prioritised.

We consider that the Sugar Mill site should be allocated for delivery/development in the short term, and brought forward as part of the larger, mixed-use development of the Sugar Mill site.

Sustainability Assessment

My client's site has been considered by the sustainability assessment as two separate sites. As per our comments above, we consider that the redevelopment of the full site to provide a mixed use scheme should also be taken into account when assessing the suitability of these specific retail and residential allocations. We support the assessment of the site against the sustainability indicators, but have comments which we would ask are considered when making the final allocations.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: TLC003

Retail

Tommy Wass (Dewsbury Road) Local Centre

Name: Bizspace

Representor No: PRS05122

Assessment of the Retail Allocation 3394

Under indicators SA1 and SA2, the site is rated as poor with regard to maintaining or improving employment sites and conditions to allow economic growth and investment. No account has been taken that the current site experiences vacancies and the site is continuously marketed. Conversion to retail will secure a higher number of permanent jobs within the area, for people who live near the area and would support equal employment opportunities. Furthermore, if included within the Tommy Wass centre, would help secure the role of the centre and lead to further investment in the local area. Also, as part of a wider mixed use development, a range of uses, including employment, could be promoted. We therefore consider that the scores of SA1 and SA2 should be increased to neutral or good. Indicator SA11 relates to the re-use of brownfield land and promoting the services for communities. The site is rated as good. It is a brownfield site directly adjacent the Tommy Wass centre and in close proximity to a large residential population. We consider the redevelopment of this site for retail will secure jobs and services for the local population and therefore should be classed as very good. Indicator SA15 relates to the transport network and the provision of services, reducing the need to travel by means other than the car. The site has been rated as good, we consider that the redevelopment to retail would help improve the retail offer in Tommy Wass, thereby significantly reducing the need for the local population to travel by car to other locations. It will also provide a local service, easily accessible by pedestrians and cyclist. Furthermore, the site is well serviced by public transport on Dewsbury Road. On this basis, we consider that the site should be rated very good.

Assessment of Housing Allocation CFSM019

Indicator SA18 relates to the reduction of pollution. The site is currently rated as poor. We consider that the rationalisation and redevelopment of the site will not be any more polluting than the existing employment use and should therefore be rated as neutral.

Representation ID: REP05698 Question Ref: R4

My client wishes to support the retail overview, particularly section 7.1 which focuses retail development in existing centres and within new boundaries identified to accommodate additional retail development. We specifically note the intention to allocate a new centre at Tommy Wass in Map 3 'Hierarchy of Centres - Town and Local Centre Designations', which is fully commended and we consider that this is a suitable and sustainable approach, securing and building upon the existing facilities in the local area. Moreover, this helps to provide shopping and other town centre uses needs near to where the local population live and work and reduces the need to travel. Which meets with the aims and policy requirements of the NPPF and Core Strategy. Sections 7.9 - 7.11 advises that some of the centres have nearby opportunities for new retail development and, where these exist, have been identified. It also states that, where retail is related to the centre, that the boundary will be revised, where possible. In Volume 2 the southerly part of our client's site, fronting Dewsbury Road is one such opportunity which has been identified adjacent to the Tommy Wass proposed centre. We consider that 1 acre of the site, fronting Dewsbury Road is a suitable retail opportunity which exists directly adjacent to the proposed centre (and notwithstanding that the use is already a 'town centre use', offices, and could be included on that basis) should be included within the boundary as a retail opportunity site. It is not physically detached from the centre in any way and we do not consider that there is any reason why it should not form part of this new centre. Indeed, should the retail opportunity be realised at this site, this would help re-enforce and consolidate the new centre and regenerate an underused site. Furthermore, the allocation of the site meets with the core planning principles identified in the NPPF, particularly in proactively driving and supporting sustainable economic development to deliver a thriving local place, responding positively to opportunities for growth and delivering missed use developments on brownfield sites.

In these terms, we support the proposal to amend the centre boundaries to take account of opportunity sites where these relate to a centre. We respectfully request that this approach is applied to our client's site and that the boundary is extended to include 1 acre at the front of our client's site, as forming part of the Tommy Wass centre.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: TLC003

Retail

Tommy Wass (Dewsbury Road) Local Centre

Name: Highcross

Representor No: PRS05195

Representation ID: REP07511 Question Ref: R1

Our comments below relate to the Tommy Wass Local Centre (Plan 10.2G) and assessment of Call for Sites under paragraph 10.2.4.

The Issues & Options document indicates that a review of each centre boundary in the outer south west area was carried out along with a survey of current uses. This included the Tommy Wass local centre. The text (paragraph 10.2.2) highlights this involved redefining boundaries of centres to accommodate retail development within centres.

The document further indicates that the Council is not allocating sites for retail in the various centres (including Tommy Wass) but by making boundary changes the Council intends this to provide scope to accommodate additional retailing.

In relation to the "Call for Sites" process and comments by officers following assessment of those representations, paragraph 10.2.4 of the Issues & Options Allocations DPD indicates that the representation site is regarded as being located within the Tommy Wass local centre. We welcome recognition of the inclusion of the site in the centre and therefore the future contribution it could make to the wider retail and service offer in the centre. However, we would request that the local centre boundary, as shown on Plan 10.2G, be amended to reflect its intended inclusion in the defined Tommy Wass centre.

In light of the above we would ask that the boundary defining the extent of the Tommy Wass local centre be corrected to reflect the conclusions reached in the assessment of sites put forward as part of the Call for Sites consultation. This identifies the representation site as being 'in centre' and that 'retail is acceptable use pending other planning considerations'.

Representation ID: REP07477 Question Ref: R1

Our comments below relate to the Tommy Wass Local Centre (Plan 10.2G) and assessment of Call for Sites under paragraph 10.2.4.

The Issues & Options document indicates that a review of each centre boundary in the outer south west area was carried out along with a survey of current uses. This included the Tommy Wass local centre. The text (paragraph 10.2.2) highlights this involved redefining boundaries of centres to accommodate retail development within centres.

The document further indicates that the Council is not allocating sites for retail in the various centres (including Tommy Wass) but by making boundary changes the Council intends this to provide scope to accommodate additional retailing.

In relation to the "Call for Sites" process and comments by officers following assessment of those representations, paragraph 10.2.4 of the Issues & Options Allocations DPD indicates that the representation site is regarded as being located within the Tommy Wass local centre. We welcome recognition of the inclusion of the site in the centre and therefore the future contribution it could make to the wider retail and service offer in the centre. However, we would request that the local centre boundary, as shown on Plan 10.2G, be amended to reflect its intended inclusion in the defined Tommy Wass centre.

In light of the above we would ask that the boundary defining the extent of the Tommy Wass local centre be corrected to reflect the conclusions reached in the assessment of sites put forward as part of the Call for Sites consultation. This identifies the representation site as being 'in centre' and that 'retail is acceptable use pending other planning considerations'.

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP08047 Question Ref: R1

The Tommy Wass lower order local centre is a reasonable designation of shops around a suburban cross roads on the A653 Dewsbury Road as it enters Leeds proper, though it might be suspected that one day there will be a call for demolitions to allow a new crossroads to be laid out. Proposed extensions CFSM019 and CFSM023 are reasonable in themselves and might replace floorspace lost in any crossroads alterations.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: TLC003

Retail

Tommy Wass (Dewsbury Road) Local Centre

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08219 Question Ref: R1

At Leeds consultation document para 10.2.1 we note and support the proposals for new local retail centres at Drighlington and East Ardsley. We also support the reduction in the size of Morley town centre; those parts deleted seem to have lost retailing by natural attrition, so the change does little more than reflect reality. The Tommy Wass lower order local centre is a reasonable designation of shops around a suburban cross roads on the A653 Dewsbury Road as it enters Leeds proper, though it might be suspected that one day there will be a call for demolitions to allow a new crossroads to be laid out. Proposed extensions CFSMO I 9 and CFSM023 are reasonable in themselves and might replace floorspace lost in any crossroads alterations.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: TLC004

Retail

East Ardsley Local Centre

Name: Lisa Mulherin

Representor No: PRS05734

Representation ID: REP07271 Question Ref: R1

Retail – I welcome the designation of East Ardsley Local Centre.

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP08047 Question Ref: R1

At Leeds consultation document para 10.2.1 we note and support the proposals for new local retail centres at Drighlington and East Ardsley.

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08219 Question Ref: R1

At Leeds consultation document para 10.2.1 we note and support the proposals for new local retail centres at Drighlington and East Ardsley. We also support the reduction in the size of Morley town centre; those parts deleted seem to have lost retailing by natural attrition, so the change does little more than reflect reality. The Tommy Wass lower order local centre is a reasonable designation of shops around a suburban cross roads on the A653 Dewsbury Road as it enters Leeds proper, though it might be suspected that one day there will be a call for demolitions to allow a new crossroads to be laid out. Proposed extensions CFSMO I 9 and CFSM023 are reasonable in themselves and might replace floorspace lost in any crossroads alterations.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: TLC048

Retail

Middleton Park Circus Local Centre

Name: Asda

Representor No: PRS05791

Representation ID: REP06489 Question Ref: R1

Middleton

With regard to Middleton we fully support the proposed extension to Middleton District Centre and the recognition of ASDA's investment to incorporate a new ASDA store, which is currently under construction. The provision of a main food store in Middleton District Centre will serve the needs of the surrounding communities in a sustainable location, complementing the other existing facilities within the District Centre.

Name: Aldi

Representor No: PRS06153

Representation ID: REP07038 Question Ref: R1

ALDI Stores Ltd are an active retailer, promoting growth and regeneration opportunities across the Leeds Borough. To date ALDI have approximately 3 trading stores, alongside planning permission for 4 additional stores at Stanningly Road, Bramley; Cardigan Fields, Leeds; Middleton Park Circus, Leeds; and Bradford Road, Guisely. A number of these stores are undergoing construction, and will be open for trade by the end of 2013. A core aim of the business is to secure its long-term viability through growth and expansion opportunities, whilst protecting its existing estate. On this note, ALDI Stores are designed to serve a local catchment, and offer many significant benefits in terms of choice and the creation of competition through low prices. In addition, each store provides local job opportunities (in store and during the construction stage), alongside retained expenditure which benefits existing retailers through linked-trips. In light of the above, we consider that Leeds City Council should seek to encourage and facilitate development, in line with the NPPF. We consider ~ that this can be achieved through the expansion of existing town centre boundaries - to include sites which already benefit from planning permission for retail use. This will be discussed in detail below.

The Leeds Site Allocations Plan will identify or 'allocate' areas of land within the Leeds district for specific types of development, such as housing, employment, retail and green space up to 2028. The Plan provides a number of 'draft' town centre maps, which clearly define the town centre boundaries of each centre, including primary and secondary shopping frontages. Firstly, we note that the Council have referred to the Council's 2011 retail study which identified a need for new retail floorspace (net) within the convenience sector up to 2026: 19,626sqm at 2016 increasing to 30,747sqm at 2021 and 41,515sqm at 2026. We have reviewed the boundaries of all centres, and have provided our comments below where applicable:

RI: Do you have any comments on the proposed centre and Primary Shopping Area (PSA) boundary? Please state the centre/s to which your comments relate. Use plans to support your comments where possible.

Outer South West Maps

Middleton Park Circus

Middleton Park Circus local centre is located on the southern edge of Middleton Park Road. The Council are promoting an identical town centre boundary, as defined in the UDP and Council's 2011 Retail Study. In 2012, ALDI Stores Ltd secured planning permission for a foodstore on the Middleton Arms Public House site, with a net sales area of 990sqm. The proposal was designed to serve as an anchor store to the centre. On the above grounds, we consider that the town centre boundary of Middleton Park Circus local centre should be extended to take into account this recent permission. Please see plan attached to Appendix 1 of this letter. Indeed, the site is located directly opposite the centre, approximately 50m north of the primary shopping frontage, with pedestrian link connecting the site to a range of independent and national retailers within the local centre. Overall, we consider the inclusion of the ALDI site a logical extension to the town centre boundary of Middleton Park Circus, given its location, and role to the neighboring shops and residents

Summary

We note that the Council in preparing their Site Allocations Document have not taken into considered recent permissions for ALDI stores within the district. It is widely acknowledged that ALDI stores play an important role within a local community and support neighboring stores and services through increased expenditure and linked trips. On this basis, we consider that the Council should reconsider their existing boundaries at Kirkstall Road and Middleton Park Circus to include the new ALDI store which will act as anchor stores to the centres.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: TLC049

Retail

Middleton (Ring Road)

Name: Mark Mills

Representor No: PRS06341

Representation ID: REP07378 Question Ref: R1

Middleton Ring Road Centre Boundary

Support the extension of the centre boundary.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: TLC052

Retail

Morley

Name: Brian Guy

Representor No: PRS00142

Representation ID: REP04934 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: Wenda P Whitehead

Representor No: PRS00312

Representation ID: REP04954 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: Janice Beever

Representor No: PRS00441

Representation ID: REP04957 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: P S Barrie

Representor No: PRS00915

Representation ID: REP04951 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Representation ID: REP04940 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Representation ID: REP04970 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: Lynne Paul

Representor No: PRS01169

Representation ID: REP04963 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: TLC052

Retail

Morley

Name: D Paul

Representor No: PRS01183

Representation ID: REP04959 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: B Stringer

Representor No: PRS01606

Representation ID: REP04961 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: L.e Beever

Representor No: PRS01607

Representation ID: REP04966 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: J Cowie

Representor No: PRS02227

Representation ID: REP04939 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: Susan Holt

Representor No: PRS02289

Representation ID: REP04943 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: Dereck Holt

Representor No: PRS02311

Representation ID: REP04937 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: Jenni Davenport

Representor No: PRS02330

Representation ID: REP04941 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: TLC052

Retail

Morley

Name: Frank Raven

Representor No: PRS02339

Representation ID: REP04942 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: E Naylor

Representor No: PRS02363

Representation ID: REP04950 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: Kathleen Paver

Representor No: PRS02372

Representation ID: REP04945 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: C Guy

Representor No: PRS02377

Representation ID: REP04938 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: C Clegg

Representor No: PRS02406

Representation ID: REP04935 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: Doreen Gill

Representor No: PRS02496

Representation ID: REP04936 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: D Naylor

Representor No: PRS02497

Representation ID: REP04944 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: TLC052

Retail

Morley

Name: A Paver

Representor No: PRS02498

Representation ID: REP04946 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: James Bowers

Representor No: PRS02500

Representation ID: REP04947 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: Alan Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02501

Representation ID: REP04948 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: Vivienne Swithenbank

Representor No: PRS02502

Representation ID: REP04949 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: Vivian Oxtoby

Representor No: PRS02504

Representation ID: REP04952 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: Beryl Hewitt

Representor No: PRS02506

Representation ID: REP04953 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: D A Clegg

Representor No: PRS02507

Representation ID: REP04955 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: TLC052

Retail

Morley

Name: Pauline Wood

Representor No: PRS02508

Representation ID: REP04956 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: Joyce Thompson

Representor No: PRS02510

Representation ID: REP04958 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: Patricia Aston

Representor No: PRS02513

Representation ID: REP04960 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: L. G Wilson

Representor No: PRS02515

Representation ID: REP04962 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: S Laurence

Representor No: PRS02517

Representation ID: REP04964 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: C Graham

Representor No: PRS02518

Representation ID: REP04965 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: M Allsop

Representor No: PRS02520

Representation ID: REP04967 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: TLC052

Retail

Morley

Name: R Hartill

Representor No: PRS02521

Representation ID: REP04968 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: Edith Holmes

Representor No: PRS02522

Representation ID: REP04969 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: Harry Holmes

Representor No: PRS02524

Representation ID: REP04971 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: Ann Morse

Representor No: PRS02526

Representation ID: REP04972 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: L.r Morse

Representor No: PRS02527

Representation ID: REP04973 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: Michael Hartill

Representor No: PRS02556

Representation ID: REP04974 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: Jim Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02561

Representation ID: REP04975 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: TLC052

Retail

Morley

Name: Helen Aveyard

Representor No: PRS02562

Representation ID: REP04976 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: Ronald Gill

Representor No: PRS02564

Representation ID: REP04978 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: A.w Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02565

Representation ID: REP04979 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: J Mcallister

Representor No: PRS02566

Representation ID: REP04980 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: Norman Dearden

Representor No: PRS02568

Representation ID: REP04977 Question Ref: R1

As the call for sites has not brought significant development potential the need to enhance the existing centres becomes more urgent. It would be of great value to the Morley Primary Shopping Area if a bus station was included in the development plan. This would solve the shambolic situation of buses clogging the area of Queen Street around the Town Hall, help pedestrian safety and improve the shopping experience of that part of the town.

Name: Neil Dawson

Representor No: PRS05884

Representation ID: REP06635 Question Ref: R1

Retail issues and options.

I support the proposals for Morley Town Centre.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: TLC052

Retail

Morley

Name: Morrisons Supermarkets Plc

Representor No: PRS06404

Representation ID: REP07483 Question Ref: R1

With reference to the above, and on behalf of our clients, Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc ('Morrisons'), we write to thank you for providing us with the opportunity to comment on the Leeds Site Allocations Issues and Options Development Plan Document.

Morrisons is a major food and grocery retailer who operate 11 foodstores in Leeds, with all but one being located within existing defined town centres. These stores perform a key role in generating a significant amount of activity and pedestrian flows, which helps to maintain the overall vitality and viability of the centres they serve. Morrisons also have a pending application (with a resolution to grant) for a new foodstore on an in-centre site at Chapel Allerton (LPA ref: 12/00822/FU). Our client would like to make comments on the above document to ensure the vitality and viability of the defined centres in Leeds.

Plan 10.2 F: Morley - we support the inclusion of the Morrisons foodstore within the Proposed Primary Shopping Area Boundary

We would be grateful if Peacock and Smith are kept informed on further stages in the preparation of Local Development Framework documents

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP08047 Question Ref: R1

We also support the reduction in the size of Morley town centre; those parts deleted seem to have lost retailing by natural attrition, so the change does little more than reflect reality.

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08219 Question Ref: R1

At Leeds consultation document para 10.2.1 we note and support the proposals for new local retail centres at Drighlington and East Ardsley. We also support the reduction in the size of Morley town centre; those parts deleted seem to have lost retailing by natural attrition, so the change does little more than reflect reality. The Tommy Wass lower order local centre is a reasonable designation of shops around a suburban cross roads on the A653 Dewsbury Road as it enters Leeds proper, though it might be suspected that one day there will be a call for demolitions to allow a new crossroads to be laid out. Proposed extensions CF5M019 and CF5M023 are reasonable in themselves and might replace floorspace lost in any crossroads alterations.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2101900

Employment

Parkside Lane Ls 11

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: E1

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2103631

Employment

Plots 2 & 3 Astra Park Parkside Lane Ls11

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: General comment

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2104440

Employment

S/o Premier House Ring Road Royds Lane Ls12

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: General comment

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2200462

Employment

Fall Lane East Ardsley Wf3

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: E3

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2201920

Employment

Former Brick Works Lingwell Gate Lane Thorpe Wf3

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: E3

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2201921

Employment

Former Brick Works Lingwell Gate Lane Thorpe Wf3

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: E3

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2201930

Employment

Thorpe Hall Thorpe Lane Thorpe Wf3

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: E3

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2300262

Employment

Plots 210-220 Howley Park Ind Est Morley

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: General comment

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2300267

Employment

Plot 460 Howley Park Ind Est Morley

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: General comment

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2300268

Employment

Plots 410 & 420 Howley Park Road East Morley Ls27

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: General comment

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2300894

Employment

Adj Ravenheat Ltd Chartists Way Morley

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: General comment

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2301350

Employment

Howley Park Ind Est Morley

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: General comment

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2301552

Employment

Bruntcliffe Lane Morley

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: E3

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP08129 Question Ref: E3

In Morley, the Motor Auctions sites on Bruntcliffe Lane (2301552 & 23040600) [NB assume they mean only site 2301552], have been the subject of a failed housing appeal and are surrounded by employment uses. This land should stay in employment use and be green on map 10.4.

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08220 Question Ref: E3

In Morley, the Motor Auctions sites on Bruntcliffe Lane (2301552 & 23040600) [NB assume they mean only site 2301552], have been the subject of a failed housing appeal and are surrounded by employment uses. This land should stay in employment use and be green on map 10.4.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2301611

Employment

Wakefield Road Gildersome

Name: Peter Ashton

Representor No: PRS00130

Representation ID: REP05238 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Brian Guy

Representor No: PRS00142

Representation ID: REP05197 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Kathleen Davis

Representor No: PRS00188

Representation ID: REP05218 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Beverley Henry

Representor No: PRS01121

Representation ID: REP05198 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2301611

Employment

Wakefield Road Gildersome

Name: P Coates

Representor No: PRS01948

Representation ID: REP05194 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: E Kamis

Representor No: PRS01961

Representation ID: REP05196 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: D Rigby

Representor No: PRS01971

Representation ID: REP05195 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2301611

Employment

Wakefield Road Gildersome

Name: B Smith

Representor No: PRS01978

Representation ID: REP05199 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Representation ID: REP05242 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: M Webster

Representor No: PRS01980

Representation ID: REP05200 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: P Carter

Representor No: PRS01986

Representation ID: REP05201 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2301611

Employment

Wakefield Road Gildersome

Name: D Carter

Representor No: PRS01992

Representation ID: REP05202 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Elaine Carter

Representor No: PRS01998

Representation ID: REP05203 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Robert Hall

Representor No: PRS02009

Representation ID: REP05204 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Emma Price

Representor No: PRS02222

Representation ID: REP05205 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2301611

Employment

Wakefield Road Gildersome

Name: J Cowie

Representor No: PRS02227

Representation ID: REP05206 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: James Mallinson

Representor No: PRS02229

Representation ID: REP05207 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: J Middleton

Representor No: PRS02231

Representation ID: REP05208 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Barnes

Representor No: PRS02236

Representation ID: REP05209 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2301611

Employment

Wakefield Road Gildersome

Name: Wormald

Representor No: PRS02238

Representation ID: REP05210 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: T White

Representor No: PRS02241

Representation ID: REP05211 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Brian Dykes

Representor No: PRS02246

Representation ID: REP05212 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Barrett

Representor No: PRS02248

Representation ID: REP05213 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2301611

Employment

Wakefield Road Gildersome

Name: K Batley

Representor No: PRS02249

Representation ID: REP05214 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: M Farnhill

Representor No: PRS02261

Representation ID: REP05215 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Sandra And Arthur Gawthorpe

Representor No: PRS02265

Representation ID: REP05216 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: P Batley

Representor No: PRS02269

Representation ID: REP05217 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2301611

Employment

Wakefield Road Gildersome

Name: Ann Raistrick

Representor No: PRS02282

Representation ID: REP05219 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: L Leatherly

Representor No: PRS02285

Representation ID: REP05220 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Helen Ainley

Representor No: PRS02288

Representation ID: REP05221 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Susan Holt

Representor No: PRS02289

Representation ID: REP05222 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2301611

Employment

Wakefield Road Gildersome

Name: Dereck Holt

Representor No: PRS02311

Representation ID: REP05223 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: S Pickering

Representor No: PRS02312

Representation ID: REP05224 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Anne And Alan Britton

Representor No: PRS02313

Representation ID: REP05225 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Helen Guy

Representor No: PRS02314

Representation ID: REP05226 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2301611

Employment

Wakefield Road Gildersome

Name: R Platt

Representor No: PRS02316

Representation ID: REP05227 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: David Stott

Representor No: PRS02317

Representation ID: REP05228 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: S Roberts

Representor No: PRS02319

Representation ID: REP05229 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: M McNicholl

Representor No: PRS02321

Representation ID: REP05230 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2301611

Employment

Wakefield Road Gildersome

Name: Jason Beecroft

Representor No: PRS02326

Representation ID: REP05231 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Peter Newsome

Representor No: PRS02328

Representation ID: REP05232 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Jenni Davenport

Representor No: PRS02330

Representation ID: REP05233 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: P Sutton

Representor No: PRS02333

Representation ID: REP05234 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2301611

Employment

Wakefield Road Gildersome

Name: Stephen And Janice Duffy

Representor No: PRS02337

Representation ID: REP05235 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: A Glen

Representor No: PRS02338

Representation ID: REP05236 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Frank Raven

Representor No: PRS02339

Representation ID: REP05237 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Kudlip Kawz

Representor No: PRS02358

Representation ID: REP05239 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2301611

Employment

Wakefield Road Gildersome

Name: Carole Deighton

Representor No: PRS02362

Representation ID: REP05240 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: E Naylor

Representor No: PRS02363

Representation ID: REP05241 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Ava D Platt

Representor No: PRS02370

Representation ID: REP05243 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Kathleen Paver

Representor No: PRS02372

Representation ID: REP05244 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2301611

Employment

Wakefield Road Gildersome

Name: Diane Taylor-reid

Representor No: PRS02374

Representation ID: REP05245 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: C Guy

Representor No: PRS02377

Representation ID: REP05246 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Howard Boyce

Representor No: PRS02384

Representation ID: REP05247 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: J Beldon

Representor No: PRS02385

Representation ID: REP05248 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2301611

Employment

Wakefield Road Gildersome

Name: A W Cooper

Representor No: PRS02387

Representation ID: REP05249 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Luke Standage

Representor No: PRS02389

Representation ID: REP05250 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: K And C Morrison

Representor No: PRS02397

Representation ID: REP05251 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: K Horner

Representor No: PRS02512

Representation ID: REP05252 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2301611

Employment

Wakefield Road Gildersome

Name: J W Crabtree

Representor No: PRS02514

Representation ID: REP05253 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: B F Thompson

Representor No: PRS02531

Representation ID: REP05254 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Charles Ollis

Representor No: PRS02532

Representation ID: REP05255 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: S Gamble

Representor No: PRS02535

Representation ID: REP05256 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2301611

Employment

Wakefield Road Gildersome

Name: S. R Searle

Representor No: PRS02649

Representation ID: REP05257 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Angela Mallinson

Representor No: PRS02650

Representation ID: REP05258 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: General comment

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2302250

Employment

Off Britannia Rd Morley

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: E1

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2302404

Employment

R/o Arlington Business Centre Millshaw Park Avenue Ls11

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: General comment

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2302530

Employment

Rods Mills Lane - High St Morley

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: E3

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2302750

Employment

Topcliffe Lane Tingley Ls27

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: General comment

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2302835

Employment

Phase 2c Capitol Park Tingley Common Tingley Wf3

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: General comment

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2302836

Employment

Phase 3 Capitol Park Tingley Common Wf3

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: E1

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2302837

Employment

Flats Adj Block B Capitol Park Tingley Common Tingley Wf3

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: General comment

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303010

Employment

Nepshaw Lane Asquith Avenue Gildersome

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: General comment

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP08129 Question Ref: E1

The site at Gildersome marked CFSM006 [employment ref 2303010 and 2303011] in lime green is an old UDP allocation; there is a planning application under consideration now and there have been unsuccessful applications in the past. It has been seen as a site for super-sized warehouses, but, potential highway access is quite poor. There needs to be imaginative discussion about this, preferably involving Gildersome Parish Council.

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08220 Question Ref: E1

The site at Gildersome marked CFSM006 [employment ref 2303010 and 2303011] in lime green is an old UDP allocation; there is a planning application under consideration now and there have been unsuccessful applications in the past. It has been seen as a site for super-sized warehouses, but, potential highway access is quite poor. There needs to be imaginative discussion about this, preferably involving Gildersome Parish Council.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303011

Employment

Moorfield Land At Nepshaw Lane Asquith Avenue Gildersome

Name: Peter Ashton

Representor No: PRS00130

Representation ID: REP05238 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Brian Guy

Representor No: PRS00142

Representation ID: REP05197 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Kathleen Davis

Representor No: PRS00188

Representation ID: REP05218 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Beverley Henry

Representor No: PRS01121

Representation ID: REP05198 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303011

Employment

Moorfield Land At Nepshaw Lane Asquith Avenue Gildersome

Name: P Coates

Representor No: PRS01948

Representation ID: REP05194 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: E Kamis

Representor No: PRS01961

Representation ID: REP05196 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: D Rigby

Representor No: PRS01971

Representation ID: REP05195 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303011

Employment

Moorfield Land At Nepshaw Lane Asquith Avenue Gildersome

Name: B Smith

Representor No: PRS01978

Representation ID: REP05242 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Representation ID: REP05199 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: M Webster

Representor No: PRS01980

Representation ID: REP05200 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: P Carter

Representor No: PRS01986

Representation ID: REP05201 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303011

Employment

Moorfield Land At Nepshaw Lane Asquith Avenue Gildersome

Name: D Carter

Representor No: PRS01992

Representation ID: REP05202 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Elaine Carter

Representor No: PRS01998

Representation ID: REP05203 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Robert Hall

Representor No: PRS02009

Representation ID: REP05204 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Emma Price

Representor No: PRS02222

Representation ID: REP05205 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303011

Employment

Moorfield Land At Nepshaw Lane Asquith Avenue Gildersome

Name: J Cowie

Representor No: PRS02227

Representation ID: REP05206 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: James Mallinson

Representor No: PRS02229

Representation ID: REP05207 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: J Middleton

Representor No: PRS02231

Representation ID: REP05208 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Barnes

Representor No: PRS02236

Representation ID: REP05209 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303011

Employment

Moorfield Land At Nepshaw Lane Asquith Avenue Gildersome

Name: Wormald

Representor No: PRS02238

Representation ID: REP05210 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: T White

Representor No: PRS02241

Representation ID: REP05211 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Brian Dykes

Representor No: PRS02246

Representation ID: REP05212 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Barrett

Representor No: PRS02248

Representation ID: REP05213 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303011

Employment

Moorfield Land At Nepshaw Lane Asquith Avenue Gildersome

Name: K Batley

Representor No: PRS02249

Representation ID: REP05214 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: M Farnhill

Representor No: PRS02261

Representation ID: REP05215 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Sandra And Arthur Gawthorpe

Representor No: PRS02265

Representation ID: REP05216 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: P Batley

Representor No: PRS02269

Representation ID: REP05217 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303011

Employment

Moorfield Land At Nepshaw Lane Asquith Avenue Gildersome

Name: Ann Raistrick

Representor No: PRS02282

Representation ID: REP05219 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: L Leatherly

Representor No: PRS02285

Representation ID: REP05220 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Helen Ainley

Representor No: PRS02288

Representation ID: REP05221 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Susan Holt

Representor No: PRS02289

Representation ID: REP05222 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303011

Employment

Moorfield Land At Nepshaw Lane Asquith Avenue Gildersome

Name: Dereck Holt

Representor No: PRS02311

Representation ID: REP05223 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: S Pickering

Representor No: PRS02312

Representation ID: REP05224 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Anne And Alan Britton

Representor No: PRS02313

Representation ID: REP05225 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Helen Guy

Representor No: PRS02314

Representation ID: REP05226 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303011

Employment

Moorfield Land At Nepshaw Lane Asquith Avenue Gildersome

Name: R Platt

Representor No: PRS02316

Representation ID: REP05227 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: David Stott

Representor No: PRS02317

Representation ID: REP05228 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: S Roberts

Representor No: PRS02319

Representation ID: REP05229 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: M McNicholl

Representor No: PRS02321

Representation ID: REP05230 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303011

Employment

Moorfield Land At Nepshaw Lane Asquith Avenue Gildersome

Name: Jason Beecroft

Representor No: PRS02326

Representation ID: REP05231 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Peter Newsome

Representor No: PRS02328

Representation ID: REP05232 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Jenni Davenport

Representor No: PRS02330

Representation ID: REP05233 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: P Sutton

Representor No: PRS02333

Representation ID: REP05234 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303011

Employment

Moorfield Land At Nepshaw Lane Asquith Avenue Gildersome

Name: Stephen And Janice Duffy

Representor No: PRS02337

Representation ID: REP05235 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: A Glen

Representor No: PRS02338

Representation ID: REP05236 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Frank Raven

Representor No: PRS02339

Representation ID: REP05237 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Kudlip Kawz

Representor No: PRS02358

Representation ID: REP05239 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303011

Employment

Moorfield Land At Nepshaw Lane Asquith Avenue Gildersome

Name: Carole Deighton

Representor No: PRS02362

Representation ID: REP05240 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: E Naylor

Representor No: PRS02363

Representation ID: REP05241 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Ava D Platt

Representor No: PRS02370

Representation ID: REP05243 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Kathleen Paver

Representor No: PRS02372

Representation ID: REP05244 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303011

Employment

Moorfield Land At Nepshaw Lane Asquith Avenue Gildersome

Name: Diane Taylor-reid

Representor No: PRS02374

Representation ID: REP05245 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: C Guy

Representor No: PRS02377

Representation ID: REP05246 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Howard Boyce

Representor No: PRS02384

Representation ID: REP05247 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: J Beldon

Representor No: PRS02385

Representation ID: REP05248 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303011

Employment

Moorfield Land At Nepshaw Lane Asquith Avenue Gildersome

Name: A W Cooper

Representor No: PRS02387

Representation ID: REP05249 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Luke Standage

Representor No: PRS02389

Representation ID: REP05250 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: K And C Morrison

Representor No: PRS02397

Representation ID: REP05251 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: K Horner

Representor No: PRS02512

Representation ID: REP05252 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303011

Employment

Moorfield Land At Nepshaw Lane Asquith Avenue Gildersome

Name: J W Crabtree

Representor No: PRS02514

Representation ID: REP05253 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: B F Thompson

Representor No: PRS02531

Representation ID: REP05254 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Charles Ollis

Representor No: PRS02532

Representation ID: REP05255 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: S Gamble

Representor No: PRS02535

Representation ID: REP05256 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303011

Employment

Moorfield Land At Nepshaw Lane Asquith Avenue Gildersome

Name: S. R Searle

Representor No: PRS02649

Representation ID: REP05257 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Angela Mallinson

Representor No: PRS02650

Representation ID: REP05258 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: General comment

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP08129 Question Ref: E1

The site at Gildersome marked CF5M006 [employment ref 2303010 and 2303011] in lime green is an old UDP allocation; there is a planning application under consideration now and there have been unsuccessful applications in the past. It has been seen as a site for super-sized warehouses, but, potential highway access is quite poor. There needs to be imaginative discussion about this, preferably involving Gildersome Parish Council.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303011

Employment

Moorfield Land At Nepshaw Lane Asquith Avenue Gildersome

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08220 Question Ref: E1

The site at Gildersome marked CFSM006 [employment ref 2303010 and 2303011] in lime green is an old UDP allocation; there is a planning application under consideration now and there have been unsuccessful applications in the past. It has been seen as a site for super-sized warehouses, but, potential highway access is quite poor. There needs to be imaginative discussion about this, preferably involving Gildersome Parish Council.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303020

Employment

Hub62 Bruntcliffe Road Morley Ls27

Name: Peter Ashton

Representor No: PRS00130

Representation ID: REP05238 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Brian Guy

Representor No: PRS00142

Representation ID: REP05197 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Kathleen Davis

Representor No: PRS00188

Representation ID: REP05218 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Beverley Henry

Representor No: PRS01121

Representation ID: REP05198 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303020

Employment

Hub62 Bruntcliffe Road Morley Ls27

Name: P Coates

Representor No: PRS01948

Representation ID: REP05194 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: E Kamis

Representor No: PRS01961

Representation ID: REP05196 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: D Rigby

Representor No: PRS01971

Representation ID: REP05195 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303020

Employment

Hub62 Bruntcliffe Road Morley Ls27

Name: B Smith

Representor No: PRS01978

Representation ID: REP05242 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Representation ID: REP05199 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: M Webster

Representor No: PRS01980

Representation ID: REP05200 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: P Carter

Representor No: PRS01986

Representation ID: REP05201 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303020

Employment

Hub62 Bruntcliffe Road Morley Ls27

Name: D Carter

Representor No: PRS01992

Representation ID: REP05202 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Elaine Carter

Representor No: PRS01998

Representation ID: REP05203 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Robert Hall

Representor No: PRS02009

Representation ID: REP05204 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Emma Price

Representor No: PRS02222

Representation ID: REP05205 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303020

Employment

Hub62 Bruntcliffe Road Morley Ls27

Name: J Cowie

Representor No: PRS02227

Representation ID: REP05206 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: James Mallinson

Representor No: PRS02229

Representation ID: REP05207 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: J Middleton

Representor No: PRS02231

Representation ID: REP05208 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Barnes

Representor No: PRS02236

Representation ID: REP05209 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303020

Employment

Hub62 Bruntcliffe Road Morley Ls27

Name: Wormald

Representor No: PRS02238

Representation ID: REP05210 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: T White

Representor No: PRS02241

Representation ID: REP05211 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Brian Dykes

Representor No: PRS02246

Representation ID: REP05212 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Barrett

Representor No: PRS02248

Representation ID: REP05213 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303020

Employment

Hub62 Bruntcliffe Road Morley Ls27

Name: K Batley

Representor No: PRS02249

Representation ID: REP05214 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: M Farnhill

Representor No: PRS02261

Representation ID: REP05215 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Sandra And Arthur Gawthorpe

Representor No: PRS02265

Representation ID: REP05216 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: P Batley

Representor No: PRS02269

Representation ID: REP05217 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303020

Employment

Hub62 Bruntcliffe Road Morley Ls27

Name: Ann Raistrick

Representor No: PRS02282

Representation ID: REP05219 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: L Leatherly

Representor No: PRS02285

Representation ID: REP05220 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Helen Ainley

Representor No: PRS02288

Representation ID: REP05221 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Susan Holt

Representor No: PRS02289

Representation ID: REP05222 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303020

Employment

Hub62 Bruntcliffe Road Morley Ls27

Name: Dereck Holt

Representor No: PRS02311

Representation ID: REP05223 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: S Pickering

Representor No: PRS02312

Representation ID: REP05224 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Anne And Alan Britton

Representor No: PRS02313

Representation ID: REP05225 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Helen Guy

Representor No: PRS02314

Representation ID: REP05226 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303020

Employment

Hub62 Bruntcliffe Road Morley Ls27

Name: R Platt

Representor No: PRS02316

Representation ID: REP05227 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: David Stott

Representor No: PRS02317

Representation ID: REP05228 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: S Roberts

Representor No: PRS02319

Representation ID: REP05229 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: M McNicholl

Representor No: PRS02321

Representation ID: REP05230 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303020

Employment

Hub62 Bruntcliffe Road Morley Ls27

Name: Jason Beecroft

Representor No: PRS02326

Representation ID: REP05231 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Peter Newsome

Representor No: PRS02328

Representation ID: REP05232 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Jenni Davenport

Representor No: PRS02330

Representation ID: REP05233 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: P Sutton

Representor No: PRS02333

Representation ID: REP05234 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303020

Employment

Hub62 Bruntcliffe Road Morley Ls27

Name: Stephen And Janice Duffy

Representor No: PRS02337

Representation ID: REP05235 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: A Glen

Representor No: PRS02338

Representation ID: REP05236 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Frank Raven

Representor No: PRS02339

Representation ID: REP05237 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Kudlip Kawz

Representor No: PRS02358

Representation ID: REP05239 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303020

Employment

Hub62 Bruntcliffe Road Morley Ls27

Name: Carole Deighton

Representor No: PRS02362

Representation ID: REP05240 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: E Naylor

Representor No: PRS02363

Representation ID: REP05241 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Ava D Platt

Representor No: PRS02370

Representation ID: REP05243 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Kathleen Paver

Representor No: PRS02372

Representation ID: REP05244 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303020

Employment

Hub62 Bruntcliffe Road Morley Ls27

Name: Diane Taylor-reid

Representor No: PRS02374

Representation ID: REP05245 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: C Guy

Representor No: PRS02377

Representation ID: REP05246 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Howard Boyce

Representor No: PRS02384

Representation ID: REP05247 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: J Beldon

Representor No: PRS02385

Representation ID: REP05248 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303020

Employment

Hub62 Bruntcliffe Road Morley Ls27

Name: A W Cooper

Representor No: PRS02387

Representation ID: REP05249 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Luke Standage

Representor No: PRS02389

Representation ID: REP05250 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: K And C Morrison

Representor No: PRS02397

Representation ID: REP05251 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: K Horner

Representor No: PRS02512

Representation ID: REP05252 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303020

Employment

Hub62 Bruntcliffe Road Morley Ls27

Name: J W Crabtree

Representor No: PRS02514

Representation ID: REP05253 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: B F Thompson

Representor No: PRS02531

Representation ID: REP05254 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Charles Ollis

Representor No: PRS02532

Representation ID: REP05255 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: S Gamble

Representor No: PRS02535

Representation ID: REP05256 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303020

Employment

Hub62 Bruntcliffe Road Morley Ls27

Name: S. R Searle

Representor No: PRS02649

Representation ID: REP05257 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Angela Mallinson

Representor No: PRS02650

Representation ID: REP05258 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: General comment

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303441

Employment

Warehouse Units Adwalton Business Park Wakefield Road Drighlington Bd11

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: General comment

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2303459

Employment

Peel Mills Commercial Street Morley Ls27

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: E1

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2304060

Employment

R/o Epsom Court Bruntcliffe Avenue Morley Ls27

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: General comment

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2304190

Employment

Unit A Bracken Park & Overland Industrial Estate Gelderd Road Gildersome Ls27

Name: Peter Ashton

Representor No: PRS00130

Representation ID: REP05238 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Brian Guy

Representor No: PRS00142

Representation ID: REP05197 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Kathleen Davis

Representor No: PRS00188

Representation ID: REP05218 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Beverley Henry

Representor No: PRS01121

Representation ID: REP05198 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2304190

Employment

Unit A Bracken Park & Overland Industrial Estate Gelderd Road Gildersome Ls27

Name: P Coates

Representor No: PRS01948

Representation ID: REP05194 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: E Kamis

Representor No: PRS01961

Representation ID: REP05196 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: D Rigby

Representor No: PRS01971

Representation ID: REP05195 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2304190

Employment

Unit A Bracken Park & Overland Industrial Estate Gelderd Road Gildersome Ls27

Name: B Smith

Representor No: PRS01978

Representation ID: REP05199 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Representation ID: REP05242 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: M Webster

Representor No: PRS01980

Representation ID: REP05200 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: P Carter

Representor No: PRS01986

Representation ID: REP05201 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2304190

Employment

Unit A Bracken Park & Overland Industrial Estate Gelderd Road Gildersome Ls27

Name: D Carter

Representor No: PRS01992

Representation ID: REP05202 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Elaine Carter

Representor No: PRS01998

Representation ID: REP05203 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Robert Hall

Representor No: PRS02009

Representation ID: REP05204 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Emma Price

Representor No: PRS02222

Representation ID: REP05205 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2304190

Employment

Unit A Bracken Park & Overland Industrial Estate Gelderd Road Gildersome Ls27

Name: J Cowie

Representor No: PRS02227

Representation ID: REP05206 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: James Mallinson

Representor No: PRS02229

Representation ID: REP05207 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: J Middleton

Representor No: PRS02231

Representation ID: REP05208 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Barnes

Representor No: PRS02236

Representation ID: REP05209 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2304190

Employment

Unit A Bracken Park & Overland Industrial Estate Gelderd Road Gildersome Ls27

Name: Wormald

Representor No: PRS02238

Representation ID: REP05210 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: T White

Representor No: PRS02241

Representation ID: REP05211 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Brian Dykes

Representor No: PRS02246

Representation ID: REP05212 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Barrett

Representor No: PRS02248

Representation ID: REP05213 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2304190

Employment

Unit A Bracken Park & Overland Industrial Estate Gelderd Road Gildersome Ls27

Name: K Batley

Representor No: PRS02249

Representation ID: REP05214 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: M Farnhill

Representor No: PRS02261

Representation ID: REP05215 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Sandra And Arthur Gawthorpe

Representor No: PRS02265

Representation ID: REP05216 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: P Batley

Representor No: PRS02269

Representation ID: REP05217 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2304190

Employment

Unit A Bracken Park & Overland Industrial Estate Gelderd Road Gildersome Ls27

Name: Ann Raistrick

Representor No: PRS02282

Representation ID: REP05219 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: L Leatherly

Representor No: PRS02285

Representation ID: REP05220 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Helen Ainley

Representor No: PRS02288

Representation ID: REP05221 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Susan Holt

Representor No: PRS02289

Representation ID: REP05222 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2304190

Employment

Unit A Bracken Park & Overland Industrial Estate Gelderd Road Gildersome Ls27

Name: Dereck Holt

Representor No: PRS02311

Representation ID: REP05223 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: S Pickering

Representor No: PRS02312

Representation ID: REP05224 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Anne And Alan Britton

Representor No: PRS02313

Representation ID: REP05225 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Helen Guy

Representor No: PRS02314

Representation ID: REP05226 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2304190

Employment

Unit A Bracken Park & Overland Industrial Estate Gelderd Road Gildersome Ls27

Name: R Platt

Representor No: PRS02316

Representation ID: REP05227 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: David Stott

Representor No: PRS02317

Representation ID: REP05228 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: S Roberts

Representor No: PRS02319

Representation ID: REP05229 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: M McNicholl

Representor No: PRS02321

Representation ID: REP05230 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2304190

Employment

Unit A Bracken Park & Overland Industrial Estate Gelderd Road Gildersome Ls27

Name: Jason Beecroft

Representor No: PRS02326

Representation ID: REP05231 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Peter Newsome

Representor No: PRS02328

Representation ID: REP05232 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Jenni Davenport

Representor No: PRS02330

Representation ID: REP05233 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: P Sutton

Representor No: PRS02333

Representation ID: REP05234 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2304190

Employment

Unit A Bracken Park & Overland Industrial Estate Gelderd Road Gildersome Ls27

Name: Stephen And Janice Duffy

Representor No: PRS02337

Representation ID: REP05235 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: A Glen

Representor No: PRS02338

Representation ID: REP05236 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Frank Raven

Representor No: PRS02339

Representation ID: REP05237 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Kudlip Kawz

Representor No: PRS02358

Representation ID: REP05239 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2304190

Employment

Unit A Bracken Park & Overland Industrial Estate Gelderd Road Gildersome Ls27

Name: Carole Deighton

Representor No: PRS02362

Representation ID: REP05240 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: E Naylor

Representor No: PRS02363

Representation ID: REP05241 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Ava D Platt

Representor No: PRS02370

Representation ID: REP05243 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Kathleen Paver

Representor No: PRS02372

Representation ID: REP05244 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2304190

Employment

Unit A Bracken Park & Overland Industrial Estate Gelderd Road Gildersome Ls27

Name: Diane Taylor-reid

Representor No: PRS02374

Representation ID: REP05245 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: C Guy

Representor No: PRS02377

Representation ID: REP05246 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Howard Boyce

Representor No: PRS02384

Representation ID: REP05247 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: J Beldon

Representor No: PRS02385

Representation ID: REP05248 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2304190

Employment

Unit A Bracken Park & Overland Industrial Estate Gelderd Road Gildersome Ls27

Name: A W Cooper

Representor No: PRS02387

Representation ID: REP05249 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Luke Standage

Representor No: PRS02389

Representation ID: REP05250 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: K And C Morrison

Representor No: PRS02397

Representation ID: REP05251 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: K Horner

Representor No: PRS02512

Representation ID: REP05252 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2304190

Employment

Unit A Bracken Park & Overland Industrial Estate Gelderd Road Gildersome Ls27

Name: J W Crabtree

Representor No: PRS02514

Representation ID: REP05253 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: B F Thompson

Representor No: PRS02531

Representation ID: REP05254 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Charles Ollis

Representor No: PRS02532

Representation ID: REP05255 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: S Gamble

Representor No: PRS02535

Representation ID: REP05256 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2304190

Employment

Unit A Bracken Park & Overland Industrial Estate Gelderd Road Gildersome Ls27

Name: S. R Searle

Representor No: PRS02649

Representation ID: REP05257 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Angela Mallinson

Representor No: PRS02650

Representation ID: REP05258 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: General comment

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2304191

Employment

Units B C & D Bracken Park & Overland Industrial Estate Gelderd Road Gildersome Ls27

Name: Peter Ashton

Representor No: PRS00130

Representation ID: REP05238 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Brian Guy

Representor No: PRS00142

Representation ID: REP05197 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Kathleen Davis

Representor No: PRS00188

Representation ID: REP05218 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Beverley Henry

Representor No: PRS01121

Representation ID: REP05198 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2304191

Employment

Units B C & D Bracken Park & Overland Industrial Estate Gelderd Road Gildersome Ls27

Name: P Coates

Representor No: PRS01948

Representation ID: REP05194 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: E Kamis

Representor No: PRS01961

Representation ID: REP05196 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: D Rigby

Representor No: PRS01971

Representation ID: REP05195 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2304191

Employment

Units B C & D Bracken Park & Overland Industrial Estate Gelderd Road Gildersome Ls27

Name: B Smith

Representor No: PRS01978

Representation ID: REP05199 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Representation ID: REP05242 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: M Webster

Representor No: PRS01980

Representation ID: REP05200 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: P Carter

Representor No: PRS01986

Representation ID: REP05201 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2304191

Employment

Units B C & D Bracken Park & Overland Industrial Estate Gelderd Road Gildersome Ls27

Name: D Carter

Representor No: PRS01992

Representation ID: REP05202 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Elaine Carter

Representor No: PRS01998

Representation ID: REP05203 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Robert Hall

Representor No: PRS02009

Representation ID: REP05204 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Emma Price

Representor No: PRS02222

Representation ID: REP05205 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2304191

Employment

Units B C & D Bracken Park & Overland Industrial Estate Gelderd Road Gildersome Ls27

Name: J Cowie

Representor No: PRS02227

Representation ID: REP05206 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: James Mallinson

Representor No: PRS02229

Representation ID: REP05207 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: J Middleton

Representor No: PRS02231

Representation ID: REP05208 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Barnes

Representor No: PRS02236

Representation ID: REP05209 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2304191

Employment

Units B C & D Bracken Park & Overland Industrial Estate Gelderd Road Gildersome Ls27

Name: Wormald

Representor No: PRS02238

Representation ID: REP05210 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: T White

Representor No: PRS02241

Representation ID: REP05211 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Brian Dykes

Representor No: PRS02246

Representation ID: REP05212 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Barrett

Representor No: PRS02248

Representation ID: REP05213 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2304191

Employment

Units B C & D Bracken Park & Overland Industrial Estate Gelderd Road Gildersome Ls27

Name: K Batley

Representor No: PRS02249

Representation ID: REP05214 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: M Farnhill

Representor No: PRS02261

Representation ID: REP05215 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Sandra And Arthur Gawthorpe

Representor No: PRS02265

Representation ID: REP05216 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: P Batley

Representor No: PRS02269

Representation ID: REP05217 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2304191

Employment

Units B C & D Bracken Park & Overland Industrial Estate Gelderd Road Gildersome Ls27

Name: Ann Raistrick

Representor No: PRS02282

Representation ID: REP05219 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: L Leatherly

Representor No: PRS02285

Representation ID: REP05220 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Helen Ainley

Representor No: PRS02288

Representation ID: REP05221 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Susan Holt

Representor No: PRS02289

Representation ID: REP05222 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2304191

Employment

Units B C & D Bracken Park & Overland Industrial Estate Gelderd Road Gildersome Ls27

Name: Dereck Holt

Representor No: PRS02311

Representation ID: REP05223 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: S Pickering

Representor No: PRS02312

Representation ID: REP05224 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Anne And Alan Britton

Representor No: PRS02313

Representation ID: REP05225 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Helen Guy

Representor No: PRS02314

Representation ID: REP05226 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2304191

Employment

Units B C & D Bracken Park & Overland Industrial Estate Gelderd Road Gildersome Ls27

Name: R Platt

Representor No: PRS02316

Representation ID: REP05227 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: David Stott

Representor No: PRS02317

Representation ID: REP05228 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: S Roberts

Representor No: PRS02319

Representation ID: REP05229 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: M McNicholl

Representor No: PRS02321

Representation ID: REP05230 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2304191

Employment

Units B C & D Bracken Park & Overland Industrial Estate Gelderd Road Gildersome Ls27

Name: Jason Beecroft

Representor No: PRS02326

Representation ID: REP05231 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Peter Newsome

Representor No: PRS02328

Representation ID: REP05232 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Jenni Davenport

Representor No: PRS02330

Representation ID: REP05233 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: P Sutton

Representor No: PRS02333

Representation ID: REP05234 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2304191

Employment

Units B C & D Bracken Park & Overland Industrial Estate Gelderd Road Gildersome Ls27

Name: Stephen And Janice Duffy

Representor No: PRS02337

Representation ID: REP05235 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: A Glen

Representor No: PRS02338

Representation ID: REP05236 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Frank Raven

Representor No: PRS02339

Representation ID: REP05237 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Kudlip Kawz

Representor No: PRS02358

Representation ID: REP05239 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2304191

Employment

Units B C & D Bracken Park & Overland Industrial Estate Gelderd Road Gildersome Ls27

Name: Carole Deighton

Representor No: PRS02362

Representation ID: REP05240 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: E Naylor

Representor No: PRS02363

Representation ID: REP05241 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Ava D Platt

Representor No: PRS02370

Representation ID: REP05243 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Kathleen Paver

Representor No: PRS02372

Representation ID: REP05244 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2304191

Employment

Units B C & D Bracken Park & Overland Industrial Estate Gelderd Road Gildersome Ls27

Name: Diane Taylor-reid

Representor No: PRS02374

Representation ID: REP05245 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: C Guy

Representor No: PRS02377

Representation ID: REP05246 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Howard Boyce

Representor No: PRS02384

Representation ID: REP05247 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: J Beldon

Representor No: PRS02385

Representation ID: REP05248 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2304191

Employment

Units B C & D Bracken Park & Overland Industrial Estate Gelderd Road Gildersome Ls27

Name: A W Cooper

Representor No: PRS02387

Representation ID: REP05249 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Luke Standage

Representor No: PRS02389

Representation ID: REP05250 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: K And C Morrison

Representor No: PRS02397

Representation ID: REP05251 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: K Horner

Representor No: PRS02512

Representation ID: REP05252 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2304191

Employment

Units B C & D Bracken Park & Overland Industrial Estate Gelderd Road Gildersome Ls27

Name: J W Crabtree

Representor No: PRS02514

Representation ID: REP05253 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: B F Thompson

Representor No: PRS02531

Representation ID: REP05254 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Charles Ollis

Representor No: PRS02532

Representation ID: REP05255 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: S Gamble

Representor No: PRS02535

Representation ID: REP05256 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2304191

Employment

Units B C & D Bracken Park & Overland Industrial Estate Gelderd Road Gildersome Ls27

Name: S. R Searle

Representor No: PRS02649

Representation ID: REP05257 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Angela Mallinson

Representor No: PRS02650

Representation ID: REP05258 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: General comment

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2401060

Employment

Former Loco Shed Site Off Royds Lane Ls 12

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: General comment

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2403250

Employment

Carr Crofts Tong Rd Ls12

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: General comment

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2403262

Employment

R/o Nina Works Cottingley Spring Gelderd Road Ls27

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: General comment

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 2403810

Employment

Opp Ravell Works Gelderd Road Wortley Ls12

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: General comment

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 394

Greenspace

East Ardsley Reservoir

Name: Trevor Sherborne
Representor No: PRS02724

Representation ID: REP05395 Question Ref: G7

On this plan, this site is open space audit. On plan 10.5B it is shown as natural green space. To me greenspace means grass, trees , open land, this site is Ardsley Reservior. All you do is walk around, you cannot play games or swim in the water. It still belongs to Yorkshire Water and they could stop public access anytime. I suppose the large green area on the map is to fool people into thinking, who do not live in the area, that we have a large area of greenspace. You cannot walk on the water, yet, take this out and we have not much, so called, greenspace left

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 399

Greenspace

Ardsley Mill Allotments

Name: Trevor Sherborne
Representor No: PRS02724

Representation ID: REP05433 Question Ref: G7

Shown as open space audit Plan 10.5B. Both sites shown as allotments. What maps are you using. Someone should get out of the office and look at these sites. I cannot remember when they were last used for allotments. I think 1542 is now earmarked for housing

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 563

Greenspace

Beeston Park Ring Road

Name: Jason Green
Representor No: PRS06321

Representation ID: REP07262 Question Ref: G1
Representation to Site Allocations Plan (Ref No. 563)

Part of the Dewsbury Road N1 greenspace corridor shown in the Site Allocations plan (Ref No. 563) should be deleted and considered for housing development. In return for the loss of greenspace an equivalent area of greenspace could be re-provided at Stank Hall Barn site, a location that is proposed for open space use in the Leeds Unitary Development Plan and the LDF Site Allocations Plan.

It is not envisaged that the whole of N1 greenspace corridor would be required for development. Development would still allow for the retention and maintenance of a narrower greenspace corridor.

The partial development of the greenspace corridor would generate a receipt from the disposal of the site that could then ring fenced and used to subsidise the cost of the restoration of Stank Hall Barn. Stank Hall Barn, which is a Grade II*listed building of significant importance, is currently on the Council's and English Heritage's register of buildings at risk.

The greenspace corridor sits between the Parkwood housing estate and Dewsbury Road and includes pedestrian routes across it. The houses on the south side of Parkwood Avenue have their rear gardens abutting the greenspace corridor. With no natural surveillance from adjacent properties the back gardens are therefore vulnerable. This vulnerability issue could be addressed through the partial development of the greenspace corridor by having proposed houses arranged with their back gardens abutting the rear gardens of those properties on Parkwood Avenue.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 635

Greenspace

Parker Street

Name: Neil Manock

Representor No: PRS03257

Representation ID: REP05629 Question Ref: G3

1. Introduction

This report outlines a consultation submission relating to land at Bradford Road/Chapel Street, East Ardsley ("the site"). The site is outlined in red on the plan and aerial image in section 2 of this report. *see pdf copy*

The report is being submitted in response to the Site Allocations Issues and Options Plan recently published by Leeds CC and should be read in conjunction with the completed online Site Allocations Plan Consultation form. This consultation was originally submitted on the 13 March 2013.

The aims of the report are to make a case for the removal of the current greenspace allocation on the site and to outline the suitability of the site for residential development.

The report will assess:

- o The current use and physical characteristics of the site.
- o Relevant planning policies relating to the site
- o The greenspace function of the site and other areas of greenspace in the area.
- o The merits of the site for residential development and identify any constraints that may exist.
- o Draw final conclusions

The report will now deal with each of these areas in turn.

2. Site Plans

See below. *see pdf copy*

3. Site Appraisal

The site extends to approximately 0.7ha or 1.73 acres and is back land situated behind the frontages of Bradford Road (A650) and Chapel Street in East Ardsley. East Ardsley is situated within the Leeds administrative district and is approximately 4 miles from Wakefield city centre and 6 miles from Leeds city centre. The site is within a few minutes drive of junction 41 of the M1 motorway. The site is currently used for vehicle and caravan storage and grazing purposes. A butchers shop and associated outbuildings form the site's frontage with Bradford Road (A650). The western half of the site where vehicles are informally stored is unsightly and an eyesore. The eastern half of the site is currently used to graze sheep and is fenced off around its entire boundary with post and rail and barbed wire fencing. There is no public access to the site or right of way over it. The site is located in a predominantly residential area surrounded on all sides by housing. The East Ardsley Conservative Club adjoins the site to the east. Boundaries are clearly defined by fencing and walls to all sides. The site slopes gently from north to south.

Vehicular access to the site is taken from Bradford Road (A650). There are no trees or hedgerows on site. There are no streams or ditches running through or adjacent to the site.

4. Planning

Policy

Planning policies that relate to the site are contained in the Leeds Revised Unitary Development Plan 2006 (RUDP) and the emerging Local development Framework (LDF) or recently renamed Local Plan.

Leeds Revised Unitary Development Plan

The RUDP makes provision for the long term use of land and buildings, providing a framework for local planning decisions. Decisions on planning applications are made in accordance with this plan unless other material considerations indicate otherwise. The site in question is allocated as greenspace in the RUDP. The site is protected under Policy N1 of the plan.

N1: DEVELOPMENT OF LAND IDENTIFIED ON THE PROPOSALS MAP AND CITY CENTRE INSET MAP AS PROTECTED GREENSPACE, WILL NOT BE PERMITTED FOR PURPOSES OTHER THAN OUTDOOR RECREATION, UNLESS THE NEED IN THE LOCALITY FOR GREENSPACE IS ALREADY MET AND A SUITABLE ALTERNATIVE SITE CAN BE IDENTIFIED AND LAID OUT AS GREENSPACE IN AN AREA OF IDENTIFIED SHORTFALL.

The RUDP written statement makes the following statements by way of explanation:

5.2.2 a greenspace should be an area "where the public has access to an open area with an existing or potential value for recreation and nature conservation".

5.2.3 "The underlying objectives of the UDP's policies for greenspace are as follows:

- i) to support the role of greenspace in providing for formal and informal outdoor recreation and nature conservation, as an integral and legitimate land use;
- ii) to ensure that greenspace is accessible and safe to those who use it, ...
- iii) to provide for a wide range of passive and active outdoor recreation opportunities as close to home as possible, giving priority to those housing areas with a relatively poor access to greenspace,
- iv) to aim to meet expressed, latent and future, formal and informal outdoor recreation demands through the retention, enhancement and provision of greenspace,
- v) to recognize the critical contribution greenspace plays in enhancing "quality of life", "sense of place" and the wider perception of the District as an attractive place to live, work, visit and in which to invest.

Policy SP1 concerns the protection of existing greenspace.

SP1: GREENSPACE IS PROTECTED AND ENHANCED AS AN IMPORTANT LAND USE IN ITS OWN RIGHT IN CONFERRING AMENITY, QUALITY OF LIFE AND A SENSE OF IDENTITY TO ESTABLISH COMMUNITIES AND PROPOSED EXTENSIONS.

Local Development Framework (LDF) / Local Plan

The LDF/Local Plan is currently being prepared to replace the Unitary Development Plan. When completed and approved the LDF/Local Plan will comprise of a Core Strategy together with Supplementary Planning Documents designed to deliver the spatial and land use strategy for the District. One such supplementary document is the Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD). The draft Site Allocations Issues and Options Report has been published recently. The site has retained its greenspace designation in the document and is identified as site 635 Parker Street Allotments at section 5.21 of the document and on Map 33. The site is categorized as allotment land. In conclusion in section 5.21 the document states that the Ardsley and Robin Hood Ward exceeds the recommended standard (provision) and so has surplus provision in terms of the quantity of allotments.

5. Assessment of Greenspace Function

Taking into account the preceding site and planning assessments, the following conclusions can be drawn on the greenspace function currently being provided by the site. The site is currently used for vehicle and caravan storage and the grazing of sheep. The majority of the site is fenced off. The only vehicle and pedestrian access to the site is an arduous access via a locked 5 bar gate to the rear of the butcher's shop off the A650. The site is not used for any form of formal or informal recreational purpose. The site is not used for allotment purposes. There are a handful of trees scattered around the site's boundaries and an intermittent hedgerow running through the centre of the site. There are no streams, ditches or watercourses running through the site. The potential for nature conservation on the site therefore appears minimal.

There is no public access to the site. The land cannot be seen to be "enhancing the quality of life" or "sense of place" for local residents and, if

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 635

Greenspace

Parker Street

Name: Neil Manock

Representor No: PRS03257

anything, part of the site could be perceived as an eyesore or nuisance. The land does not significantly contribute to the area being an attractive place to live and work....".

It can therefore be concluded that the site is currently not performing a greenspace function in the way the UDP allocation intended and that the greenspace allocation on this site is now inappropriate and should be removed as part of the review of allocations in the forthcoming Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD).

6. Other Greenspace

This particular location in East Ardsley enjoys a good provision of formal and informal recreational facilities. A large area of football pitches is situated just to the north of the site and East Ardsley cricket pitch is to the south of the site. East Ardsley also enjoys an urban fringe location with easy footpath access into the open countryside for the majority of residents. The Site Allocations Issues and Options Plan has incorporated a full review of greenspace provision and need within the Ardsley and Robin hood Ward. The review concludes that the ward is deficient in parks and gardens and outdoor sports facilities and play areas, but has a surplus in amenity, allotments and natural greenspace.

Due to the physical nature and location of the site and the constraints to public access already demonstrated, the site is not considered suitable for contributing towards the shortfall in parks, gardens and outdoor sports facilities. As the site is not performing an existing greenspace function and has limited potential to contribute to future greenspace requirements it can be concluded that the greenspace allocation on the site should be removed.

7. Suitability of the Site for Residential Development

Should it be accepted that the site is not performing a greenspace function, the site could be considered suitable for some form of residential development. The site is in a sustainable location. The site is situated in the middle of a residential area, surrounded by housing and with good access to local shops and amenities and the M1 motorway. There are no obvious physical constraints that would hamper the development of the site. Access to the site could be made available from Bradford Road or Chapel Street and Cherry Tree Walk subject to negotiations with third parties. Mains drainage and services are available in adjacent Chapel Street and Royston Hill. The site is not within a flood risk area.

There are no mature trees on site, no evidence of protected ecology and no public rights of way cross the site. The site is in a family ownership who would be willing participants to any development. The site is therefore available, suitable and deliverable for immediate residential development. Furthermore a residential allocation would bring the site into productive use and reduce the risk of the site deteriorating further and becoming a nuisance.

8. Conclusions/Recommendations

For the reasons outlined in this report we recommend that the current greenspace allocation on the site should be removed and not included in the forthcoming Site Allocations Development Plan Document. In addition we recommend that the site be allocated for residential development in the same Site Allocations Development Plan Document.

Name: D Binks

Representor No: PRS04956

Representation ID: REP00403 Question Ref: G1

Greenspace 635 Parker Street East Ardsley to be deleted as a greenspace allocation

Representation ID: REP00403 Question Ref: G3

Greenspace site 635 Parker Street East Ardsley

Representation ID: REP00403 Question Ref: General comment

Yes please refer to the attached report "Land off Bradford Road/Chapel Street, East Ardsley, Consultation Submission, Site Allocations Issues and Options Plan, 2 July 2013.This document recommends the removal of greenspace 635 Parker Street, East Ardsley as an area of greenspace and inclusion in the DPD as a future housing allocation.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 637

Greenspace

Kirkham Cricket Club

Name: Trevor Sherborne

Representor No: PRS02724

Representation ID: REP05395 Question Ref: G7

Again an open space audit. Plan10.5B shown as outdoor sports provision. I believe it did use to be Kirkmamgate Cricket Club. I can never remember it ever been used as that and now on the site is a farmhouse and barn. So how can this site be used for sports.

Question for all three sites, has anybody visited the areas before naming them as greenspace on sports provision on the maps?

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 662

Greenspace

Thorpe Wood

Name: Trevor Sherborne
Representor No: PRS02724

Representation ID: REP05395 Question Ref: G7

Site is open space audit. Plan 10.5B shown as natural greenspace. Has anyone bothered to inspect the site. It is a rubbish tip with what looks like a "signal box" built on it. Also looks to be used for off road bikes. How can anyone call this greenspace

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: 1542

Greenspace

Common Lane Allotments (South)

Name: Trevor Sherborne

Representor No: PRS02724

Representation ID: REP05433 Question Ref: G7

Shown as open space audit Plan 10.5B. Both sites shown as allotments. What maps are you using. Someone should get out of the office and look at these sites. I cannot remember when they were last used for allotments. I think 1542 is now earmarked for housing

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: CFSM003

Call For Sites

Makro Store, Royds Lane, Lower Wortley Road, Leeds, LS12 6HU

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H4

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Amber Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 2 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We are be minded to recommend that these site were not prioritised for housing until other more accessible site have been considered. Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small low capacity sites are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H4

Disagree with Council's amber assessment, think the site should be green

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H4

Disagree with Council's amber assessment, think the site should be green

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: CFSM006

Call For Sites

Land Between Gelderd Road/Asquith Avenue and Nepshaw Lane, Gildersome

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: General comment

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Representation ID: REP08047 Question Ref: R3

Plan 10.2H shows "call for sites" out-of-centre retail bids at sites CFSM006, CFSM040, CFSM047, to all of which we object. The first two would divert retailing away from established centres, and the third additionally would be in Green Belt.

Representation ID: REP08129 Question Ref: E1

The site at Gildersome marked CFSM006 [employment ref 2303010 and 2303011] in lime green is an old UDP allocation; there is a planning application under consideration now and there have been unsuccessful applications in the past. It has been seen as a site for super-sized warehouses, but, potential highway access is quite poor. There needs to be imaginative discussion about this, preferably involving Gildersome Parish Council.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: CFSM006

Call For Sites

Land Between Gelderd Road/Asquith Avenue and Nepshaw Lane, Gildersome

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Representation ID: REP08219 Question Ref: R3

NPPF guidance defending town and city centres makes clear that out-of-town centres like the White Rose Shopping Centre should not be designated as LDF retail centres. The suggested mixed retail and housing at White Rose also seems unacceptable. Plan 10.2H shows "call for sites" out-of-centre retail bids at sites CFSM006, CFSM040, CFSM047, to all of which we object. The first two would divert retailing away from established centres, and the third additionally would be in Green Belt. The Tommy Wass lower order local centre is a reasonable designation of shops around a suburban cross roads on the A653 Dewsbury Road as it enters Leeds proper, though it might be suspected that one day there will be a call for demolitions to allow a new crossroads to be laid out. Proposed extensions CFSM019 and CFSM023 are reasonable in themselves and might replace floorspace lost in any crossroads alterations.

Representation ID: REP08220 Question Ref: E1

The site at Gildersome marked CFSM006 [employment ref 2303010 and 2303011] in lime green is an old UDP allocation; there is a planning application under consideration now and there have been unsuccessful applications in the past. It has been seen as a site for super-sized warehouses, but, potential highway access is quite poor. There needs to be imaginative discussion about this, preferably involving Gildersome Parish Council.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: CFSM010

Call For Sites

Land Off Topcliffe Lane, Morley And to The North Of Capitol Park, Leeds

Name: Peter Ashton

Representor No: PRS00130

Representation ID: REP05238 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Brian Guy

Representor No: PRS00142

Representation ID: REP05197 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Kathleen Davis

Representor No: PRS00188

Representation ID: REP05218 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Beverley Henry

Representor No: PRS01121

Representation ID: REP05198 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: CFSM010

Call For Sites

Land Off Topcliffe Lane, Morley And to The North Of Capitol Park, Leeds

Name: P Coates

Representor No: PRS01948

Representation ID: REP05194 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: E Kamis

Representor No: PRS01961

Representation ID: REP05196 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: D Rigby

Representor No: PRS01971

Representation ID: REP05195 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)

343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.

Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented.

Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: CFSM010

Call For Sites

Land Off Topcliffe Lane, Morley And to The North Of Capitol Park, Leeds

Name: B Smith

Representor No: PRS01978

Representation ID: REP05242 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Representation ID: REP05199 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: M Webster

Representor No: PRS01980

Representation ID: REP05200 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: P Carter

Representor No: PRS01986

Representation ID: REP05201 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: CFSM010

Call For Sites

Land Off Topcliffe Lane, Morley And to The North Of Capitol Park, Leeds

Name: D Carter

Representor No: PRS01992

Representation ID: REP05202 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Elaine Carter

Representor No: PRS01998

Representation ID: REP05203 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Robert Hall

Representor No: PRS02009

Representation ID: REP05204 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Emma Price

Representor No: PRS02222

Representation ID: REP05205 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: CFSM010

Call For Sites

Land Off Topcliffe Lane, Morley And to The North Of Capitol Park, Leeds

Name: J Cowie

Representor No: PRS02227

Representation ID: REP05206 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: James Mallinson

Representor No: PRS02229

Representation ID: REP05207 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: J Middleton

Representor No: PRS02231

Representation ID: REP05208 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Barnes

Representor No: PRS02236

Representation ID: REP05209 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: CFSM010

Call For Sites

Land Off Topcliffe Lane, Morley And to The North Of Capitol Park, Leeds

Name: Wormald

Representor No: PRS02238

Representation ID: REP05210 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: T White

Representor No: PRS02241

Representation ID: REP05211 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Brian Dykes

Representor No: PRS02246

Representation ID: REP05212 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Barrett

Representor No: PRS02248

Representation ID: REP05213 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: CFSM010

Call For Sites

Land Off Topcliffe Lane, Morley And to The North Of Capitol Park, Leeds

Name: K Batley

Representor No: PRS02249

Representation ID: REP05214 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: M Farnhill

Representor No: PRS02261

Representation ID: REP05215 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Sandra And Arthur Gawthorpe

Representor No: PRS02265

Representation ID: REP05216 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: P Batley

Representor No: PRS02269

Representation ID: REP05217 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: CFSM010

Call For Sites

Land Off Topcliffe Lane, Morley And to The North Of Capitol Park, Leeds

Name: Ann Raistrick

Representor No: PRS02282

Representation ID: REP05219 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: L Leatherly

Representor No: PRS02285

Representation ID: REP05220 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Helen Ainley

Representor No: PRS02288

Representation ID: REP05221 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Susan Holt

Representor No: PRS02289

Representation ID: REP05222 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: CFSM010

Call For Sites

Land Off Topcliffe Lane, Morley And to The North Of Capitol Park, Leeds

Name: Dereck Holt

Representor No: PRS02311

Representation ID: REP05223 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: S Pickering

Representor No: PRS02312

Representation ID: REP05224 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Anne And Alan Britton

Representor No: PRS02313

Representation ID: REP05225 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Helen Guy

Representor No: PRS02314

Representation ID: REP05226 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: CFSM010

Call For Sites

Land Off Topcliffe Lane, Morley And to The North Of Capitol Park, Leeds

Name: R Platt

Representor No: PRS02316

Representation ID: REP05227 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: David Stott

Representor No: PRS02317

Representation ID: REP05228 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: S Roberts

Representor No: PRS02319

Representation ID: REP05229 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: M McNicholl

Representor No: PRS02321

Representation ID: REP05230 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: CFSM010

Call For Sites

Land Off Topcliffe Lane, Morley And to The North Of Capitol Park, Leeds

Name: Jason Beecroft

Representor No: PRS02326

Representation ID: REP05231 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Peter Newsome

Representor No: PRS02328

Representation ID: REP05232 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Jenni Davenport

Representor No: PRS02330

Representation ID: REP05233 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: P Sutton

Representor No: PRS02333

Representation ID: REP05234 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: CFSM010

Call For Sites

Land Off Topcliffe Lane, Morley And to The North Of Capitol Park, Leeds

Name: Stephen And Janice Duffy

Representor No: PRS02337

Representation ID: REP05235 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: A Glen

Representor No: PRS02338

Representation ID: REP05236 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Frank Raven

Representor No: PRS02339

Representation ID: REP05237 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Kudlip Kawz

Representor No: PRS02358

Representation ID: REP05239 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: CFSM010

Call For Sites

Land Off Topcliffe Lane, Morley And to The North Of Capitol Park, Leeds

Name: Carole Deighton

Representor No: PRS02362

Representation ID: REP05240 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: E Naylor

Representor No: PRS02363

Representation ID: REP05241 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Ava D Platt

Representor No: PRS02370

Representation ID: REP05243 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Kathleen Paver

Representor No: PRS02372

Representation ID: REP05244 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: CFSM010

Call For Sites

Land Off Topcliffe Lane, Morley And to The North Of Capitol Park, Leeds

Name: Diane Taylor-reid

Representor No: PRS02374

Representation ID: REP05245 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: C Guy

Representor No: PRS02377

Representation ID: REP05246 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Howard Boyce

Representor No: PRS02384

Representation ID: REP05247 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: J Beldon

Representor No: PRS02385

Representation ID: REP05248 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: CFSM010

Call For Sites

Land Off Topcliffe Lane, Morley And to The North Of Capitol Park, Leeds

Name: A W Cooper

Representor No: PRS02387

Representation ID: REP05249 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Luke Standage

Representor No: PRS02389

Representation ID: REP05250 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: K And C Morrison

Representor No: PRS02397

Representation ID: REP05251 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: K Horner

Representor No: PRS02512

Representation ID: REP05252 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: CFSM010

Call For Sites

Land Off Topcliffe Lane, Morley And to The North Of Capitol Park, Leeds

Name: J W Crabtree

Representor No: PRS02514

Representation ID: REP05253 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: B F Thompson

Representor No: PRS02531

Representation ID: REP05254 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Charles Ollis

Representor No: PRS02532

Representation ID: REP05255 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: S Gamble

Representor No: PRS02535

Representation ID: REP05256 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: CFSM010

Call For Sites

Land Off Topcliffe Lane, Morley And to The North Of Capitol Park, Leeds

Name: S. R Searle

Representor No: PRS02649

Representation ID: REP05257 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Angela Mallinson

Representor No: PRS02650

Representation ID: REP05258 Question Ref: General comment

Employment sites and possible employment sites (could also be used for housing)
343 Gildersome 5.147ha, 1018B Topcliffe Lane 26.840ha, 112 Newpshaw Lane 16.305ha, 3007 Junction 27 Gildersome 3.708ha, 1064A Bruntcliffe Road 7.58ha. This last site also has conditions placed on it and those should be included in the LDF.
Development of all these sites which are close to the A650 would put a vast unacceptable amount of traffic on to a road which is already classed as being over loaded by the highway department and would create total gridlock, the problems we have on the A650 are well documented. Schools are filling up at an alarming rate, health and care facilities police etc are facing more cuts in funding all putting a strain on the infrastructure. Morley has no need for anymore industrial estates, warehouses, offices etc. While there may be need for a realistic number of houses to be built the need to keep open green buffer zones between areas should be maintained these play an important part in all local communities. Brownfield sites such as Tingley Mills, land at the bottom of High Street, Bridge Street, Fountain Street and the many brownfield sites in Leeds, just to name a few should be developed first. IT appears that Leeds has not spoken to other local councils about their development plans because what and where they build also affects Morley. The numbers do not add up and are impractical, unsustainable and will cause utter chaos.

Name: Sterling Capitol

Representor No: PRS05764

Representation ID: REP06448 Question Ref: E1

Yes. Site CSM010 - Land Off Topcliffe Lane and to the north of Capitol Park Leeds

We note that plan 10.4 – Employment Outer South West includes the four sites that comprise Capitol Park Leeds i.e. sites refs: 2302835, 2302836, 2302837 and 2302750 and these are coded 'green'. However, we also note that the land to the north of Capitol Park i.e. site CSM010 (as illustrated on the attached copy of Plan 10.4) is coded 'amber'. Furthermore, it has not been included in Table 10.4.3 within the 'Site Allocations Plan Volume 2: 10 Outer South West' and there appears to be no separate assessment of this site (other than that for housing under site Refs 1018A and 1018B) within the published documents.

As outlined above under response to Question H3, the site is being promoted for future residential and employment development. For the reasons outlined above, we consider that it accords with draft Core Strategy Spatial Policy 1 and has clear potential for future allocation, not just for housing, but also employment. Given that the published documentation does not include the Council's assessment of this site in terms of potential for employment then we reserve the right to review and comment when these have been made available.

Name: Neil Dawson

Representor No: PRS05884

Representation ID: REP06631 Question Ref: E2

I would reiterate the need to exclude site CFSM010 from potential employment use as this would be detrimental the Green Belt around Morley.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: CFSM010

Call For Sites

Land Off Topcliffe Lane, Morley And to The North Of Capitol Park, Leeds

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 3 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' and fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if this site would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. We agree that these sites would not be suitable for housing development.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: E2

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Representation ID: REP08129 Question Ref: E2

We object most strongly to the site at Topcliffe marked CFSM010, coloured amber on plan I 0.4. It would be a huge inroad into Green Belt, totally unjustifiable when employment land supply in Leeds is calculated in decades rather than years. [NB This site was not listed within the table of potential employment sites in OSW and therefore was not allocated an employment ref number. Instead, the comment has been linked to its housing call for sites number].

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Representation ID: REP08220 Question Ref: E2

We object most strongly to the site at Topcliffe marked CFSM010, coloured amber on plan I 0.4. It would be a huge inroad into Green Belt, totally unjustifiable when employment land supply in Leeds is calculated in decades rather than years. [NB This site was not listed within the table of potential employment sites in OSW and therefore was not allocated an employment ref number. Instead, the comment has been linked to its housing call for sites number].

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: CFSM019

Call For Sites

Sugar Mill, Oakhurst Avenue (Just Off Dewsbury Road), Leeds, LS11 7DF

Name: Bizspace

Representor No: PRS05122

Representation ID: REP07752 Question Ref: R3

Site CFSM019

Sections 7.9 - 7.11 advises that some of the centres have nearby opportunities for new retail development and, where these exist, have been identified. It also states that, where retail is related to the centre, that the boundary will be revised, where possible. In Volume 2 the southerly part of our client's site, fronting Dewsbury Road is one such opportunity which has been identified adjacent to the Tommy Wass proposed centre. We consider that 1 acre of the site, fronting Dewsbury Road is a suitable retail opportunity which exists directly adjacent to the proposed centre (and notwithstanding that the use is already a 'town centre use', offices, and could be included on that basis) should be included within the boundary as a retail opportunity site. It is not physically detached from the centre in any way and we do not consider that there is any reason why it should not form part of this new centre. Indeed, should the retail opportunity be realised at this site, this would help re-enforce and consolidate the new centre and regenerate an underused site. Furthermore, the allocation of the site meets with the core planning principles identified in the NPPF, particularly in proactively driving and supporting sustainable economic development to deliver a thriving local place, responding positively to opportunities for growth and delivering missed use developments on brownfield sites.

We support the inclusion of the Tommy Wass as a new proposed centre, but note that the boundary on Plan 10.2 extends directly to the west of our client's site, but does not include it. However, within table 10.2.4 the comments section confirms that the site, reference: CFSM019, is already located in the centre and that retail is acceptable, pending other planning consideration. We respectfully request that given the existing office use of the site and confirmation that the site represents a suitable retail opportunity site, that the section fronting Dewsbury Road is included within the centre boundary as it appears that it's exclusion from the boundary is an error, as it is inconsistent with table 10.2.4. With no other sites within the Tommy Wass boundary, there is little, or no, further opportunity to promote further investment in the centre. Accordingly, our client's site represents the only sustainable allocation to allow any potential future needs of the local area to be met within the plan period. Furthermore, we agree and support the Council's assessment of sites under 10.2.4, that our client's site represents the most sequentially preferable site put forward under the call for sites exercise and therefore meets with the requirements of the NPPF and Core Strategy, which seek to promote a centre first strategy. We support the proposed allocation of the front part of the site for retail, as part of a wider mixed use development.

Under indicators SA1 and SA2, the site is rated as poor with regard to maintaining or improving employment sites and conditions to allow economic growth and investment. No account has been taken that the current site experiences vacancies and the site is continuously marketed. Conversion to retail will secure a higher number of permanent jobs within the area, for people who live near the area and would support equal employment opportunities. Furthermore, if included within the Tommy Wass centre, would help secure the role of the centre and lead to further investment in the local area. Also, as part of a wider mixed use development, a range of uses, including employment, could be promoted. We therefore consider that the scores of SA1 and SA2 should be increased to neutral or good.

Indicator SA11 relates to the re-use of brownfield land and promoting the services for communities. The site is rated as good. It is a brownfield site directly adjacent the Tommy Wass centre and in close proximity to a large residential population. We consider the redevelopment of this site for retail will secure jobs and services for the local population and therefore should be classed as very good.

Indicator SA15 relates to the transport network and the provision of services, reducing the need to travel by means other than the car. The site has been rated as good, we consider that the redevelopment to retail would help improve the retail offer in Tommy Wass, thereby significantly reducing the need for the local population to travel by car to other locations. It will also provide a local service, easily accessible by pedestrians and cyclist. Furthermore, the site is well serviced by public transport on Dewsbury Road. On this basis, we consider that the site should be rated very good.

See rep for full details.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: CFSM019

Call For Sites

Sugar Mill, Oakhurst Avenue (Just Off Dewsbury Road), Leeds, LS11 7DF

Name: Highcross

Representor No: PRS05195

Representation ID: REP05773 Question Ref: R1

SUGAR MILL SITE, LAND AT OAKHURST AVENUE/DEWSBURY ROAD, LEEDS LS11 7DF

LEEDS LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK: SITE ALLOCATIONS DPD: ISSUES AND OPTIONS

We enclose a pro-forma on behalf of our client "Highcross" relating to the above consultation event seeking views on the Allocations DPD Issues and Options document.

Background

We submitted an earlier representation as part of the Call for Sites in March 2012 (letter dated 29th March 2012) seeking inclusion of the site within the Tommy Wass (Dewsbury Road) Local Centre. This was under representation reference CFSM019. At that time the emerging LDF Core Strategy identified the site as adjoining the local centre. Our earlier representation highlighted that the centre had very limited convenience shopping provision and was relatively run down in appearance and in need of regeneration and investment. The representation sought inclusion of the wider site within the centre boundary as appropriate for mixed use development including retail, employment and housing.

Our comments below in relation the Issues & Options Site Allocations DPD relates to the 'Outer South West Retail Issues & Options' with particular reference to retail matters (paragraph 10.2.0). We deal with matters below using the 'Questions on Retail Issues and Options' set out under paragraph 10.2.4. In particular we address QR1 and QR3.

QR1 — Do you have any comments on the proposed centre and Primary Shopping Area (PSA) boundary? Please state the centre/s to which your comments relate.

Our comments below relate to the Tommy Wass Local Centre (Plan 10.2G) and assessment of Call for Sites under paragraph 10.2.4.

The Issues & Options document indicates that a review of each centre boundary in the outer south west area was carried out along with a survey of current uses. This included the Tommy Wass local centre. The text (paragraph 10.2.2) highlights this involved redefining boundaries of centres to accommodate retail development within centres. The document further indicates that the Council is not allocating sites for retail in the various centres (including Tommy Wass) but by making boundary changes the Council intends this to provide scope to accommodate additional retailing.

In relation to the "Call for Sites" process and comments by officers following assessment of those representations, paragraph 10.2.4 of the Issues & Options Allocations DPD indicates that the representation site is regarded as being located within the Tommy Wass local centre. We welcome recognition of the inclusion of the site in the centre and therefore the future contribution it could make to the wider retail and service offer in the centre. However, we would request that the local centre boundary, as shown on Plan 10.2G, be amended to reflect its intended inclusion in the defined Tommy Wass centre.

In light of the above we would ask that the boundary defining the extent of the Tommy Wass local centre be corrected to reflect the conclusions reached in the assessment of sites put forward as part of the Call for Sites consultation. This identifies the representation site as being 'in centre' and that 'retail is acceptable use pending other planning considerations'.

Representation ID: REP07511 Question Ref: R3

We support conclusions reached in relation to the inclusion of the representation site (CFSM019) within the defined Tommy Wass local centre boundary. We request that the boundary, as drawn in the Issues & Options document, be extended to reflect the conclusions reached in the assessment of sites put forward as part of the 'call for sites' process.

Representation ID: REP07477 Question Ref: R3

We support conclusions reached in relation to the inclusion of the representation site (CFSM019) within the defined Tommy Wass local centre boundary. We request that the boundary, as drawn in the Issues & Options document, be extended to reflect the conclusions reached in the assessment of sites put forward as part of the 'call for sites' process.

We trust the above comments and enclosed pro-forma will be taken into account as the Allocations DPD moves forward to the next stage.

If you require any further information at this stage, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: CFSM019

Call For Sites

Sugar Mill, Oakhurst Avenue (Just Off Dewsbury Road), Leeds, LS11 7DF

Name: Highcross

Representor No: PRS05195

Representation ID: REP05773 Question Ref: R3

QR3 Do you have any comments on the 'call for sites', sites coming forward for retail uses within the plan period?

We support conclusions reached in relation to the inclusion of the representation site (CFSM019) within the defined Tommy Wass local centre boundary. We request that the boundary, as drawn in the Issues & Options document, be extended to reflect the conclusions reached in the assessment of sites put forward as part of the 'call for sites' process.

We trust the above comments and enclosed pro-forma will be taken into account as the Allocations DPD moves forward to the next stage.

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H1

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green Sites outside the Core Public Transport Network

Table 1 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' but fall outside 400m of the current core bus network. Consideration needs to be given to if these sites would be able to meet the LDF public transport accessibility requirements should housing be brought forward. Significant developer contributions will be required at these sites to improve the public transport to meet the council LDF accessibility policies; particularly in the larger sites should these be brought forward for development. These include SHLAA ref: 2062, 1032, 1046, 1017 & 1055.

Sites which fall marginally outside the 400m catchments and have high bus frequencies or are small sites low capacity are less of concern but are flagged up nonetheless.

The table also includes accessibility assessments results to access other services and facilities within acceptable journey times on public transport.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: E2

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

• Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: CFSM019

Call For Sites

Sugar Mill, Oakhurst Avenue (Just Off Dewsbury Road), Leeds, LS11 7DF

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H1

Agree with green allocation

Representation ID: REP08047 Question Ref: R3

The Tommy Wass lower order local centre is a reasonable designation of shops around a suburban cross roads on the A653 Dewsbury Road as it enters Leeds proper, though it might be suspected that one day there will be a call for demolitions to allow a new crossroads to be laid out. Proposed extensions CFSM019 and CFSM023 are reasonable in themselves and might replace floorspace lost in any crossroads alterations.

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H1

Agree with green allocation

Representation ID: REP08219 Question Ref: R3

NPPF guidance defending town and city centres makes clear that out-of-town centres like the White Rose Shopping Centre should not be designated as LDF retail centres. The suggested mixed retail and housing at White Rose also seems unacceptable. Plan 10.2H shows "call for sites" out-of-centre retail bids at sites CFSM006, CFSM040, CFSM047, to all of which we object. The first two would divert retailing away from established centres, and the third additionally would be in Green Belt. The Tommy Wass lower order local centre is a reasonable designation of shops around a suburban cross roads on the A653 Dewsbury Road as it enters Leeds proper, though it might be suspected that one day there will be a call for demolitions to allow a new crossroads to be laid out. Proposed extensions CFSM019 and CFSM023 are reasonable in themselves and might replace floorspace lost in any crossroads alterations.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: CFSM023

Call For Sites

116, Old Lane, Beeston, Leeds LS11

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H4

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 4 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites which have potential to be allocated for housing' and 'Sites which have potential but issues or not as favoured as green sites' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network.

The sites in this list are supported for housing growth.

Site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network)

From a public transport perspective, we would encourage the prioritisation of these sites based on the proximity to the core public transport network and the bus service frequency levels.

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites - amber sites are linked to this comment]

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: E2

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Representation ID: REP08047 Question Ref: R3

The Tommy Wass lower order local centre is a reasonable designation of shops around a suburban cross roads on the A653 Dewsbury Road as it enters Leeds proper, though it might be suspected that one day there will be a call for demolitions to allow a new crossroads to be laid out.

Proposed extensions CFSM019 and CFSM023 are reasonable in themselves and might replace floorspace lost in any crossroads alterations.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: CFSM023

Call For Sites

116, Old Lane, Beeston, Leeds LS11

Name: Tom Leadley
Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7
Agree with red allocation

Representation ID: REP08219 Question Ref: R3

NPPF guidance defending town and city centres makes clear that out-of-town centres like the White Rose Shopping Centre should not be designated as LDF retail centres. The suggested mixed retail and housing at White Rose also seems unacceptable. Plan 10.2H shows "call for sites" out-of-centre retail bids at sites CFSM006, CFSM040, CFSM047, to all of which we object. The first two would divert retailing away from established centres, and the third additionally would be in Green Belt. The Tommy Wass lower order local centre is a reasonable designation of shops around a suburban cross roads on the A653 Dewsbury Road as it enters Leeds proper, though it might be suspected that one day there will be a call for demolitions to allow a new crossroads to be laid out. Proposed extensions CFSM019 and CFSM023 are reasonable in themselves and might replace floorspace lost in any crossroads alterations.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: CFSM040

Call For Sites

Wakefield Road, Gildersome, Morley, Leeds

Name: Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust

Representor No: PRS05780

Representation ID: REP06462 Question Ref: H7

I am writing on behalf of our client, Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust, in response to the consultation on the Issues and Options version of the Site Allocations Plan, and in particular a parcel of land off Wakefield Road in Gildersome. The site is referenced 3007, CFSM040 and 2301611.

The site was allocated in the Unitary Development Plan under reference E3B:7 for industry/warehousing and ancillary offices. The current consultation document includes details of the site under Table 10.4.1 of Volume 2, document 10 – Outer South West which lists "sites for office development." It appears the site has been included in this table because planning permission was granted under reference 23/360/03/RE for office development. The table is quite right to note the permission has now lapsed and to reflect the most up to date status of the land at the time the consultation was drafted.

There does however appear to be some conflicts within Volume 2, document 10 - Outer South West which shows the site to be rejected for a mixed use scheme on Plan 10.3, but then shows the site to benefit from planning permission/allocation for a mixed use scheme on Plan 10.4 and be identified for office development under Table 10.4.1.

Irrespective of the content of the current consultation document, we wish to bring to your attention how events have now moved on again. Since the consultation document was published Planning Committee has resolved to grant planning permission for a mixed use scheme comprising B1, B2, C1, A3 and A4 uses under reference 10/04597/OT subject to the signing of a Section 106 Agreement. The intention to grant planning permission means that details of the site under Table 10.4.1 of Volume 2, document 10 are now out of date and incorrect, especially given the predominant use is no longer for offices. We expect planning permission to be confirmed after 9th August.

Once the site has a valid planning permission it becomes a 'commitment' and part of the Council's supply of land. As you will be aware, the allocation of land is only required where a site does not benefit from planning permission in order to establish the principle of development is acceptable and to establish a future supply of land for development. Where a site has planning permission then not only has the principle been established, but the status of the site as part of the Councils' land supply has been confirmed. We therefore believe details of the site only need to be noted as part of the Council's supply of land. Once planning permission has been confirmed, the site will not therefore need to be specifically allocated within the Local Plan for development. This point also applies to other sites within the document (and listed under Table 10.4.1 and 10.4.2) that have planning permission and therefore do not need to be specifically allocated for development. On the basis of the process for preparing Local Plans, we hope the list of commitments under Table 10.4.1 and 10.4.2 is simply to provide an explanation of those sites that contribute to the land supply rather than the Council's intention to allocate the land in the Site Allocations Plan. The list will however need to be updated as the process progresses.

In terms of those sites which were allocated in the UDP, but do not benefit from planning permission, there is an additional point to make in terms of procedures for preparing Local Plans. The point is that previous allocations cannot simply be carried forward. It is necessary to undertake an assessment to determine the deliverability of the sites in order to determine whether they will contribute to the land supply during the Plan period or should in fact be deleted because they are unlikely to come forward. In the case of the Leeds Site Allocations Plan it is also necessary to undertake such an assessment of UDP allocations to be carried forward because the sites have not previously been subjected to the necessary Sustainability Appraisal.

We do however appreciate that where planning permission has expired then it is appropriate to allocate land in order to re-establish the principle of development. This is however no longer the case with the land off Wakefield Road, Gildersome.

We will write again once planning permission has been confirmed in order to update you on the situation.

I hope you will reflect the points made in this letter in the next version of the Site Allocations Plan.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: CFSM040

Call For Sites

Wakefield Road, Gildersome, Morley, Leeds

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network. From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Representation ID: REP08105 Question Ref: General comment

2. Employment Sites

A basic accessibility assessment has been undertaken for the Employment sites. In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network - within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;

The RAG approach we have added is based on the proximity to the core bus network:

- Green - Sites within 400 metres from the core network;
- Amber- Sites between 401 and 600 metres from the core network;
- Red - Sites over 600 metres from the core network.

It should be noted that the RAG assessment is based on the current network and should be used as an indication of the sites accessibility. A number of the larger sites are inevitably classed as Red due the size of the allocation (over 400m) and due to the fact the existing uses do not require bus services (i.e. they are Greenfield site). Where Amber and Red sites are brought forward, there will be an expectation of the developer to raise public transport levels to accessibility levels set out in the LDF policy i.e. 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford.

[See representation submitted for full details and table of sites. This rep no. links to sites in Outer South West area]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Representation ID: REP08047 Question Ref: R3

Plan 10.2H shows "call for sites" out-of-centre retail bids at sites CFSM006, CFSM040, CFSM047, to all of which we object. The first two would divert retailing away from established centres, and the third additionally would be in Green Belt.

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Representation ID: REP08219 Question Ref: R3

NPPF guidance defending town and city centres makes clear that out-of-town centres like the White Rose Shopping Centre should not be designated as LDF retail centres. The suggested mixed retail and housing at White Rose also seems unacceptable. Plan 10.2H shows "call for sites" out-of-centre retail bids at sites CFSM006, CFSM040, CFSM047, to all of which we object. The first two would divert retailing away from established centres, and the third additionally would be in Green Belt. The Tommy Wass lower order local centre is a reasonable designation of shops around a suburban cross roads on the A653 Dewsbury Road as it enters Leeds proper, though it might be suspected that one day there will be a call for demolitions to allow a new crossroads to be laid out. Proposed extensions CFSM019 and CFSM023 are reasonable in themselves and might replace floorspace lost in any crossroads alterations.

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: CFSM046

Call For Sites

Cotton Mill and Grove Farm Dewsbury Road, Leeds

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network. From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Site Comments - Outer South West

Site reference: CFSM047

Call For Sites

White Rose Shopping Centre Dewsbury Road, Leeds

Name: Michael Long

Representor No: PRS06750

Representation ID: REP07983 Question Ref: H7

1. Housing Sites

In order to assess the site we have considered the following accessibility criteria:

- Access to the Core Bus Network- within 400m of 4 buses per hour to Leeds, Wakefield or Bradford;
- 20 minutes to primary health;
- 20 minutes to primary education;
- 30 minutes to a secondary school.

The assessments undertaken are based on the current public transport network. For this consultation Metro have compared the outputs of these accessibility criteria against the RAG classifications given by the council. The results for the housing sites are shown in proceeding tables:

Table 1 -Green sites with poor accessibility

Table 2- Amber sites with poor accessibility

Table 3- Red sites with poor accessibility

Table 4- Green and Amber Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5- Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

[See full representation submitted for details of the tables]

Red Sites within the Core Public Transport Network

Table 5 below contains sites that are classified as 'Sites not considered suitable for allocation for housing' that fall within 400m of the current core bus network. From a public transport perspective, these sites (in principle) would be acceptable for housing development. For the larger sites, site specific mitigation would be required but it is unlikely that substantial bus service provision would be required at these sites (based on the current public transport network).

[see table in full representation submitted which lists sites]

Name: Morley Town Council Planning Committee

Representor No: PRS06826

Representation ID: REP07896 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Representation ID: REP08047 Question Ref: R3

NPPF guidance defending town and city centres makes clear that out-of-town centres like the White Rose Shopping Centre should not be designated as LDF retail centres. The suggested mixed retail and housing at White Rose also seems unacceptable.

Plan 10.2H shows "call for sites" out-of-centre retail bids at sites CFSM006, CFSM040, CFSM047, to all of which we object. The first two would divert retailing away from established centres, and the third additionally would be in Green Belt.

Name: Tom Leadley

Representor No: PRS07137

Representation ID: REP08217 Question Ref: H7

Agree with red allocation

Representation ID: REP08219 Question Ref: R3

NPPF guidance defending town and city centres makes clear that out-of-town centres like the White Rose Shopping Centre should not be designated as LDF retail centres. The suggested mixed retail and housing at White Rose also seems unacceptable. Plan 10.2H shows "call for sites" out-of-centre retail bids at sites CFSM006, CFSM040, CFSM047, to all of which we object. The first two would divert retailing away from established centres, and the third additionally would be in Green Belt. The Tommy Wass lower order local centre is a reasonable designation of shops around a suburban cross roads on the A653 Dewsbury Road as it enters Leeds proper, though it might be suspected that one day there will be a call for demolitions to allow a new crossroads to be laid out. Proposed extensions CFSM019 and CFSM023 are reasonable in themselves and might replace floorspace lost in any crossroads alterations.