

Added congestion

Overwhelming local opposition

TATE ACTION GROUP
TAG

Gridlock on the bridge again

Does this look like brownfield to you?

**TAG - THORP ARCH TRADING ESTATE ACTION GROUP
OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION 16/05226/OT**

Contact: Peter Locke, Chairman. 14 Thorp Arch Park, Thorp Arch, LS23 7AN

VOLUME 3

**STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY
INVOLVEMENT.**

**Objection to Planning Application 16/05226 for 874 dwellings etc.
Volume 3.**

Objection to the Statement of Community Involvement (“SCI“)

Overall objection:

TAG considers that the SCI put forward by the Applicant represents a detailed description of a consultation process which, in relation to the residential community of Thorp Arch, was comprehensive in its stated objectives but significantly incorrect in the conclusions drawn from such consultation.

Whilst there appeared to be an attempt to take into account the views of the community, in reality the Applicant and its representatives were engaged in a rather cynical “tick box” exercise with pre-formed views of what the Application would contain. The Applicant did not take any account of the serious objections being made at the public exhibition and made no attempt to address these objections in the eventual Application.

The Applicant has stated in its Application (section 3.2.5) the following:

“Overall the feedback indicated that people recognised that the proposal represented an appropriate use of the site and that it was of a sensible scale and embodied high quality urban design principles”.

The record of the feedback from residents given to the Applicant’s advisors at the aforementioned exhibition on 19th May 2016 is attached as an Appendix. Please note that this feedback was supplied to us by the Applicant after the said exhibition. **Never has an Applicant’s statement as quoted above been so contradicted by its own evidence.**

Of the total feedback from residents, the statistics are as follows:-

232 negative comments were received and only 16 positive;

By category:

- on Transport and Highways issues, 129 negative and only 6 positive;
- on Planning and Urban Design issues, 41 negative and only 4 positive;
- on Environment and Contamination issues, 34 negative and 0(zero) positive.

Any analysis demonstrates the strongly held concerns over the inadequacy of the transport and highways approach, supported by major concerns over the

failure to address the contamination and environment issues on what TAG considers to be only a partially brownfield site.

The overwhelming feedback conclusions are that:

- the TATE site and proposed development for residential housing is not sustainable;
- the local roads are at capacity and traffic mitigation plans unworkable;
- serious and dangerous contamination risks were being ignored to the detriment of future residents.

The Applicant had entered into a Pre-Application process, which would have resulted in a presentation to the City Plans Panel of Leeds City Council. This would have given the opportunity for all concerned to make their views known. At short notice, the Applicant terminated the Pre-Application process, and decided to proceed directly to submit its Application. **So much for consultation.** N.B. The applicants `Engagement Strategy` stipulated a presentation to the City Plans Panel in week 11.

Misrepresentation of the views of those attending the Stakeholder Event meeting on 15th April 2016.

The Applicant and Pegasus have stated in paragraph 2.12 of the SCI that Thorp Arch PC and Walton PC by way of follow up letters (Appendices F and G respectively of the SCI) showed encouragement of the renewed scheme. This statement is factually incorrect and can only be attributed to the Applicant wishing to give the impression that the local community representatives are supportive of the Application. This is cynical spin at its best.

The letters from Thorp Arch Parish Council and from Walton Parish Council were sent in good faith and can be described as a polite way of saying “we agree to disagree” with a hope that constructive engagement would follow. Sadly, that has failed to materialise.

It is clear from the letters in question, and from the Minutes of the Stakeholders’ meeting, that there are major concerns shared by TAPC, Walton PC and Boston Spa PC to the scheme being put forward. TAG believes that the local communities of Walton, Thorp Arch and Boston Spa are united in their opposition to this Application. Furthermore, these concerns have NOT been addressed in the Application now submitted.

Summary:

The Applicant has failed in its consultation objective of promoting social cohesion by making real connection with communities and offering them a tangible stake in decision making.

This Application shows complete disregard for local views and the damage that will be done to the heritage, environment and future

sustainability of the rural and distinct village communities directly affected by the proposed development.

All these communities are united in opposition to this latest Application and it should be rejected.

Appendix

Feedback provided by Pegasus Group on behalf of Rockspring Hanover Property Unit Trust following the public exhibition on 19th May 2016

Summary of Feedback Form Responses

The comments submitted on the feedback forms have been summarised and split into categories for what each of the comments relate to.

TRANSPORT	
Ref no.	Comment
E3	Thought needs to be given to preventing rat running through Walton Village. A major issue now, that will only be worse with more development.
E4	Build roundabout at Walton Corner. Traffic lights top of Smiddy Hill / British Library junction.
E2	traffic is a great concern, but hopefully will be managed.
E5	Road between Walton Rd between site and A1 should be improved. Shops would be used by trading estate and library need more parking. Could have former rail bridge brought back into use - link to East end and Boston Spa.
E6	Bridge needs to be addressed to improve safety, traffic etc., not just about queuing (waiting just very messy and unsafe). There are no rights of way or passing places on the bridge.
E7	Local infrastructure cannot cope with any more traffic. Traffic signals may help but double yellow lines on Boston Spa (bridge road) would be brilliant.
E8	Major concern with a proposed 1000 additional houses, traffic will increase full fold and the infrastructure will not be able to service a development of such magnitude. I am strongly against this development.
E9	Concern is primarily to do with increased traffic on a country road. Church Causeway is not wide enough to manage potentially 2000 more cars. Parking in Wetherby is already problematic. Thorp arch is absolutely the wrong place to consider a development of any more than 50 houses. Knock on effect would be intolerable.
E10	900 houses = 1800 cars. Church Causeway down bridgefoot into Boston Spa currently tales back at least 1 1/2 miles daily. Traffic lights will not eliminate the problem. Thorp Arch village and the bridge taking traffic through to Boston is already a huge problem.
E11	Initial overflow into already overcrowded local village. The current road infrastructure will not take any more cars/buses/bikes. Rush hours makes this completely congested.

E13	Traffic congestion on bridge road route to and into Boston Spa. The access onto Church Causeway is totally unacceptable Site will be isolated and cars dominated. Congestion of traffic in Walton village are a safety concern.
E15	The proposed new development does not address the principle issue of traffic management. Boston spa bridge and A1 access roundabout. These bottlenecks are already major issue and the increase in traffic from 1,000 more homes at peak times will make things worse.
E16	Traffic is the big issue. Top of 5th avenue by the British Library should be a roundabout. Not action at top of Causeway/Walton Rd. Boston Spa only a new bridge will solve the problem. Need to encourage traffic onto Rudgate.
E20	Volume of traffic which will be significantly increased. Very difficult at peak times. Why not upgrade the unused bridge that crosses the Wharf to Newton Kyme. That would relieve Boston Spa.
E21	This development should not go ahead. Traffic implications not thought through, already a dangerous road. Public transport only has occasional buses; everyone will need a car.
E22	This has been going on for years and is found to be unsustainable. Traffic is an issue and always will be. Only suggestion is use traffic lights at Boston Bridge.
E23	Volume of traffic using roads is already causing problems, with tailbacks and congestion plus huge problems during construction. The aspect of contamination does not appear to have been fully addressed. The idea should be dropped and scrapped once and for all.
E26	A1 bridge not suitable for present traffic, construction traffic. Who wants a home adjacent to a prison, sewage works, rubbish tip and cement works? 900 homes will generate 1500 cars. This is double the existing number in Walton & Thorp Arch combined. Traffic lights will not solve this. Site access is v poor. The 2015
E27	Traffic through Thorp Arch and over bridge to Boston Spa already a problem at certain times and congestion on Bridge Rd causes many delays. Increase in traffic on bridge could cause future structural problems.
E28	1000 names = 1700-2000 cars, this would make the current road structure impossible - a few roundabouts and crossings are totally inadequate. The location does not fall/fit within the LCC or the NPPF requirements for sustainability.
E29	The proposed traffic route is not sustainable. 1000 houses = 2 cars per house = 2000 extra cars on the roads. Using buses do not work. It will be car dominated. The clearing of contaminated land in some places is so contaminated that they have to remove 8 metres in depth - how costly is that. Location is not
E31	Traffic will be one of the biggest problems. Contamination issues is another problem. A new village should have not only a primary school - high school too, doctors, dentist. Existing roads are already congested.
E32	Concerned about contamination, considerable impact of increased traffic, healthcare and dentists which is already stretched.
E33	It will generate an enormous amount of additional traffic as 1,000 homes is double the size of Walton and Thorp Arch. Could not cope with increased volume.
E34	Traffic measures are still totally inadequate. The build is on the most contaminated part of the estate. No account for doctors, dentist, shops.

E40	The increases in traffic due to extra units on the trading estate will add to the congestion. The site is not sustainable and has been turned down for development previously.
-----	--

E42	Traffic is the big problem. Gate should be a vehicle exit. Bridge to BS is already a nightmare. Traffic signals as proposed will block BS High St.
E43	Biggest problem is traffic flow and v busy in rush hour. Need more exits for cars.
E44	Traffic will become gridlocked. Where will additional 100+ children per year go? Where will people get their healthcare until centre is built?
E46	Think 3,000 cars extra a day is far too many. New road would need to be built to take traffic.
E47	Traffic issues will dominate. UDP found it unsustainable. The scheme does not meet planning criteria and should be withdrawn.
E48	Control of far more additional traffic. Still not a sustainable development.
E53	Traffic along Boston Spa bridge, Walton Rd and A659 towards A58 are already v heavy. No plans for GP or dentist. Will generate extra 2000 cars. I strongly object to the proposals.
E54	Very concerned re the traffic on surrounding roads. Local services are already stretched.
E55	Don't think this project is sustainable. 890-1000 houses = at least 2 cars per household.
E59	Traffic implications on Thorp Arch and Boston Spa are huge, none of the measures suggested would help. It is not sustainable.
E62	Your plans re traffic are unrealistic. Plans for Bridge St/TA Bridge is unworkable at busy times this is gridlocked. This area does not have the road infrastructure to deal with this additional traffic.
E64	Our concerns centre on the number of potential vehicles and lack of road improvements. Have rail links been considered? Traffic lights will not solve the problem.
E65	Presently roads are congested. Other concern is contamination of this site. There are no plans for extra public transport. It will be a disaster.
E67	The scheme does not adequately address the actual behaviour of motor traffic. If the proposal goes ahead there will be significant disruption to local residents due to inadequate provision of road access.

E68	Traffic flow through Thorp Arch will be unmanageable and most importantly unsafe. Building up to 1,000 houses will lead to chaos. The bridge road cannot sustain any further increase in traffic.
-----	---

E69	The issue of traffic over Thorp Arch bridge will continue to be a problem. Traffic light proposal will not solve traffic flow issues.
E71	I am concerned about the potential increase in traffic volume.
E74	Unless all the facilities are built from day one and unless traffic can be stopped from moving through Thorp Arch, Walton & Wighill villages, this proposal is unsustainable. The local shops are oversubscribed. Care home in Boston Spa has closed down.
E75	None of the traffic congestion concerns I have, have been addressed - all solutions previously offered were considered to be insufficient.
E76	Not sustainable. Major concerns over traffic flow. Prefer site to be developed for employment use - not residential. Relief road is unrealistic.
E77	The development is non-viable and totally unacceptable because of the effect of traffic on local area.
E79	It will generate a lot of traffic. The route cannot cope with increased traffic volume. How will construction traffic move around?
E80	Traffic major problem as already over congested. The proposed development will be bigger than the two villages. We do not need an influx of at least 4-4500 people plus all cars. This development will be car dependant. It will be built on contaminated land next to a Category B prison.
E81	Extra houses and extra roads would make unrealistic demands on the roads.
E82	Plan for 1,000 houses will not be sustainable as the road network will not cope with the additional traffic.
E84	Whatever plans proposed for traffic management will not deter drivers from wanting to go into Boston Spa. Traffic lights would result in increasing queues of traffic. The existing road network is not sufficient for an increase of traffic.
E90	Site is not suitable for development. Current roads unable to cope with current traffic. Who wants to buy a house next door to a prison? Proposal is frankly ridiculous.
E92	Can Boston Spa cope with the extra transport? Parking on Bridge Rd causes issues now - lights will not help.
E94	Traffic lights on Thorp Arch Bridge not good. Traffic will back up. Eco and safety aspects of site clearance.

E97	Traffic on Boston bridge. Impact on Walton village. Traffic during construction.
-----	--

E99	Traffic lights at bridge at Boston Spa is going to be absolute carnage for getting in and out of car park. People will stop using the local roads there.
E101	Junction1 & 3 will enter Walton Road. Concern would be that all traffic pushed this way. Would want some way of reducing traffic.
E102	Walton-Wetherby already busy, extra cars at peak hours will cause hold ups, mayhem over the bridge and congestion in Boston Spa. Site does not fit the LCC core strategy or the NPPF requirements for sustainability.
E103	New roads will massively increase the traffic on Walton Road. Walton/Wetherby Road is very dangerous.
E108	I don't believe that the current road infrastructure can support another 900 cars. Sheer weight of traffic will only be made worse unless there is another way to take it away from Walton & Thorp Arch.
E109	The project is unsustainable. The amount of traffic on Bridge Road is at limit already. Putting lights up will cause even bigger hold ups.
E113	The traffic on the new bridge in between Boston Spa and Thorp Arch is a problem now. Any number of cars crossing the bridge will cause terrible problems. This has not been properly thought through.
E114	This will attract 2000 vehicles needing to use the local infrastructure. We consider a significantly different traffic proposal is required if this proposal is to become viable.
E115	The proposal was rejected some time ago as not sustainable and nothing has changed. 1000 houses will generate a massive increase in traffic. Conclusion - it is nonsense to proceed.
E116	The road infrastructure cannot absorb additional traffic. There is no additional capacity for this scale of traffic.
E117	Transport access is the big issue. It is not appropriate to envisage or consider additional traffic into or Boston Spa. The only answer is obviously far too costly i.e. build another bridge.
W1	LCC are also trying to encourage commuters into Leeds to use public transport and discouraging new public car parks in Leeds centre. As it is now, arriving into Leeds by car after 8am - you will struggle to find a parking space. Travelling to Leeds by bus from Thorp Arch is not a viable option and can take up to 1 hr 20 mins in rush hour - hence having to drive. diverting the bus route to accommodate the proposed new housing - would impact on existing residents in The Woodland and Walton Chase - as it would bypass this part of Church Causeway.

W2	The questions at the bottom of the feedback form offer choices between two unacceptable non-solutions, and are deliberately biased in an attempt to gain 'evidence' which the developer can subsequently use to misinterpret local opinion. Neither option adequately addresses the issue.
----	--

W3	Access from Church Causeway and on to Bridge Road is totally unworkable and will result in a massive rat run through Thorp Arch and total traffic congestion in the village. Bridge Road is already a big problem and needs resolving before any extra traffic can even be considered. None of the highways options are workable and any development of the site will cause horrendous traffic problems for the area.
W4	The proposed traffic controls on the bridge will result in queuing and severe congestion on the A659 High Street in Boston Spa as well as Thorp Arch Village. The recent bridge closure in Tadcaster has already given some indication of the impact of increased traffic.
W6	Traffic levels already high - Thorp Arch would suffer as a Rat Run and the bridge to Boston Spa would be overwhelmed.
W7	Local highways will not cope with the increase in traffic which this car dominated site will cause. The bridge over the A1(M) already has significant queuing at peak times. Single track bridge to Boston Spa already impacted by closure of bridge in Tadcaster and cannot cope with further traffic. on street parking and access from side roads and the car park will potential cause grid lock. At the moment the bridge works on courtesy - if there are traffic lights, then people will drive through if it is their turn regardless of whether the bridge is clear.
W9	Local Road network cannot cope with a development of this size. The single track bridge is already a bottleneck, making it unsafe for children to cross the road, especially with motorists speeding across it - Proposals for traffic lights here are inadequate and unworkable.
W9	Only safe option would be a relief road which bypass's Thorp Arch completely/Build a new river crossing, enabling direct access from the new development to the main road between Tadcaster and Boston SPA.
W10	Inadequate public transport links.
W11	Proposals for traffic mitigation in Boston Spa are unworkable and would bring the A659 to a stand still
W12	Local area already has major traffic congestion problems. Transport links to major centres are virtually non-existent and the development will be totally car dependant.
W13	You state that the existing roads will support substantial development. If that statement is correct, there should be no need to consider major junction alterations, bus gates or traffic light controls. This development will cause more congestion in Thorp Arch/Boston Spa as no amenities within development.
W14	Traffic will be horrendous, speeding and congestion will be a real problem on an already dangerous road. Construction traffic is a worry.
W16	Accessibility to the site is horrendous failing almost all LCC criteria - public transport, cycling and walking are not practical means of access services and people will drive instead. Roads surrounding the site are already dangerous and require speed cameras in part on the bridge route. Resident parking on bridge road makes large segment of the road essentially single carriageway. Which even with the existing traffic flow, already results in considerable congestion and delay.
W18	Traffic generated would be unacceptable - the single track bridge and main street wont cope with increased traffic. In the daytime cars, vans and buses etc have to shunt and mount pavements to gain passage through the village. People will have to use cars to get to places of work.
W19	Traffic Plans will not work.

W20	Congestion created would be unacceptable especially on the bridge which is already tricky to negotiate, and traffic lights here would only exasperate the problem. All HGV traffic would need to be directed towards Wetherby as there is a HGV ban in Tadcaster.
-----	---

W21	<p>Access to the site is poor failing virtually all LCC criteria - obtaining daily needs by public transport/walking/cycling is not practical. Area already subject to heavy traffic congestion, additional traffic will only make this worse.</p> <p>Shortage of short stay car parking and adding additional traffic will make the situation intolerable.</p> <p>Speed cameras along Walton Road are testament to the fact the roads are dangerous.</p>
W22	Proposed highway works appear to resolve nothing regarding the impact upon the rural highway network. The site is far too small to be self-contained and will be a car dependant dormitory community.
W23	<p>Increased traffic flow through our villages; simply adding traffic lights or putting on a few more buses won't work.</p> <p>Noticed an increase in traffic since Tadcaster Bridge closed.</p>
W24	Transport proposals are totally inadequate, especially over the bridge to Boston Spa.
W25	Highway network cannot cope with the increase in traffic and highway works proposed appear to create even more congestion and volume through Walton and over the bridge to Boston Spa.
W26	<p>I walk my 8-year-old son to school alongside an already ridiculously over congested road. The road system and bridge into Boston Spa is already a logistical mess with serious backlog issues at peak times - this development will only add exponentially to this.</p> <p>Have not considered ultra-peak flows of traffic when the large companies such as moores/British library/prison etc. close.</p>
w27	Long term traffic problems regarding traffic and the use of services in the area. The road proposed is not sufficient to support a project this large and therefore will result in negative impacts for the existing community.
W28	Haven't addressed the traffic situation, queuing over the A1 as far as Wetherby Race course and at the bridge to Boston Spa as far as Church Causeway.
W29	Boston Spa Bridge at rush hour am/pm is impossible to cross. Local villages cannot cope with more traffic, as it couldn't when there were changes made to the A1(M) several years ago.
W30	<p>Increased traffic as a result of the development cannot be mitigated within the locality. Two proposed options are unworkable and the new junction to Church Causeway is to exit on the brow of a hill on a blind bend.</p> <p>Currently at peak times, 1530 - 1700 there are as many as 20 plus vehicles queuing from the bridge in either direction since the Tadcaster Bridge closure.</p>
W31	Traffic signals in Boston Spa will exasperate the traffic issues. Access to the site is very poor. Obtaining daily needs using public transport, or by walking/cycling is not practical.
W31	How long will the build last? How will the construction traffic be managed?
W32	Highways are already overburdened, and the proposed road configuration will fail in its objective of diverting highway users away from e.g. the bridge to Boston spa, and arterial access roads.
W34	Existing roads and river bridge cannot cope with building materials traffic.

W36	Lived in the village for 21 years and the traffic going through the village has increased over that time considerably. Bus often gets stuck on the hill causing traffic to back up on the bridge. There have been a number of times when children have been hit by traffic through the village travelling to the trading estate. The additional traffic which will be generated by the development will be unsustainable and there isn't the capacity in the local roads.
-----	---

W37	Single track bridge is already virtually at capacity. Dangerous surrounding roads evidenced by multiple speed cameras and unlikely to be able to cope with increased in traffic.
W38	Proposed plans for the highways look woefully inadequate and no acknowledgement of the additional traffic the development would cause. How long would the lights be on red for on A659? What would this impact on queueing times?
W39	1,000 homes are a highways disaster. It is car dominated and in an isolate location which already suffers from a bad road network, especially in Thorp Arch Village and Boston Spa. More cars, more delivery vehicles, more buses, more pollution, more accidents, more personal stress, more public unrest, more road rage, lower quality of life.
W40	Experience tells us that residents will commute to the main centres of employment and not work on the site as suggested. Congestion, safety and pollution from exhausts are already a problem on the bridge route to Boston Spa and through Thorp Arch Village.
W41	Inevitable increase in the volume of traffic going through the villages. Already congestion problems on the bridge to Boston spa and on the Walton-Wetherby Road.
W35	Local road infrastructure already at capacity. Realistically people won't use public transport, walk or cycle to used facilities and services. Buses take too long to get to the hubs of Leeds, Harrogate and York. Such a large development would be better suited being located closer to the national road network such as the abandoned plans at Headley Hall.
e63	Road system is inadequate
E91	The bridge will not be able to cope with traffic.
E17	Proposal for Rudgate village does not address the issue of sustainability and the traffic problems such a development would create. I do not support any development for housing on this site.
E19	Traffic considerations. The Walton Wetherby Rd is already dangerous.
E24	No objection to development as long as families without cars purchase. Planning permission should be granted only if a new road to the A1 is being built at your expense. No traffic to Boston Spa.
E30	No issue with planned development. Concern is planned highway numbers in and out of the site + demand to cope with extra households using them.
E38	Traffic is very bad. Additional extra housing will cause endless problems. We are a country area and do not want any large housing development.
E39	Traffic - no solution presented.
E25	Traffic lights not a good plan.
E47	Traffic issues will dominate. Proposals for bridge will not work.
E57	Access to the site - traffic will be significantly increased.

E60	Will bring massive flow of traffic, 1000 homes = 2-3,000 cars on site, how can existing roads cope. When will the proposed shops, school and surgery be constructed.
E72	Transport options are a sticking plaster on an existing problem. Neither traffic options resolve the additional 2000+ car movements a day.
E73	Access / traffic - proposals are superficial and naïve.
E35	Traffic calming on bridge will work from 1-6pm.
E36	Traffic problems - your plan won't help.
E41	The number of houses will lead to increase in the number of vehicles which will pollute the area. Construction traffic for 10 years will block access and cause delays.

E50	Access a major problem. 1000 houses = 2500 residents, 2000 cars. Traffic lights will not work.
E58	Road system totally inadequate for further development.
E61	How will bus routes cope plus most importantly roads.
E70	I am totally opposed to any more housing due to the massive increase of traffic and damage to the local wildlife habitat. Traffic lights or no traffic lights, the extra traffic will be horrendous
E85	Divert traffic away from Wighill Lane (J5). Have Church Causeway as the main entrance to the village. Have Walton Corner as the bus gate with no traffic exiting there. Convert Wighill Lane into a cycle friendly road.
E88	The highways are unable to cope already at certain times. No heavy vehicles allowed over the bridge?
E89	Increased traffic.
E95	Bridge to Boston jams twice a day.
E96	Road network will not cope.
E98	Traffic management inadequate.
E100	Traffic system would only exercise congestion in Boston. Traffic lights on thorp bridge = disaster.
E106	Boston Spa cannot cope with anymore volume of traffic.
E107	Will generate significant volume of traffic.
E110	The amount of extra traffic will make our home unsafe and loose value.

PLANNING AND URBAN DESIGN

Ref no.	Comment
E3	Nice design. Would like to see phasing plans delivery of parks and landscaping first. Phasing housing first gives local villages all traffic and no benefits.
E6	Urban design nice. Central park. Appreciate need for housing. Infrastructure v important.
E14	Good design is essential. Advantages large employment centre. Use of existing roads. Problem. The effect on the single truck bridge to Boston Spa. Good design is essential. Potential for improved use of the site. The Churchfields development in Boston Spa turned out to be much better than anticipated. I now tend to support the proposal.
E37.	Planned design excellent. I approve. Heavy vehicles during construction via only 2 exits. Congestion most of day. Need extra access exit below prison to Thorp Arch.
W1	Proposal is based upon LCC encouraging the establishment of new villages on the outskirts of Leeds.

W2	Proposals did not address any of the objections already raised in respect of the previous planning application for this site, local views and objections have therefore been ignored. From talking with the team it is apparent that the application is being pushed in the expectation that political expediency will overcome legitimate planning based objections.
W4	The size of the development is more than twice the size of Walton and thorp arch together, and is in essentially a rural area with a road network to match. Also the idea that people will live and work on the site is wishful thinking. The site will become a dormitory commuter development. Not Brownfield site. This development does not fit the LCC Core Strategy or the National Requirements for sustainability.

W5	This site is unsustainable and found to be incapable of being made so by a Planning Inspector. 80% of the site is not brownfield land.
W6	Disproportionately large compared to the surrounding villages. The development does not actually meet planning requirements. Not a brownfield site.
W7	This site is non-compliant with LCC's Core Strategy - not being part of a major settlement nor (exceptionally) greenbelt. TATE should be an employment site with other employment options pursued such as a Science and Technology Park
W10	Development will create a commuter ghetto almost exclusively dependent upon private car use. Development should be rejected in favour of sites which are closer to local centres of employment (York, Leeds, Harrogate) which are less car - reliant, exploit/re-use brownfield site.
W12	The site does not constitute sustainable development. 1000 dwellings are twice the size of the adjacent villages and will therefore change the nature of the area. You do not appear to be including the Neighbourhood Planning Teams. Do not believe this is a brownfield site.
W14	The number of houses is too high and will spoil the rural location. The expectation that people will live and work within the village is nonsense.
W15	An appropriate use of the site. The current proposal is at a sensible scale and will provide the much needed additional housing in this area of Leeds.
W16	Scheme fails to comply with Planning Regulations - doesn't fit into the LCC Core Strategy nor the NPPF for sustainability. The development is approx. double that which exists in surrounding villages will result in total domination of the area and destruction of its character and create a dormitory commuter development and would not integrate into the existing community. Inadequate infrastructure - danger to residents - this scheme would take years to complete and many of the consequences would not be immediately apparent.
W18	1000 new homes are totally unacceptable and is double the number of existing dwellings in the neighbouring villages, changing the character of this rural area. Not a brownfield site. Classified unsustainable by a government inspector.

W20	900 homes are more than twice that of Walton and Thorp Arch combined. No evidence to support that people would move to the estate who already work there. Site does not align with the LCC Core Strategy or NPPF requirements for sustainability.
W21	Not sustainable development, over 1000 homes is double the existing number in Walton and Thorp Arch combined and 6 times the size of Church Fields. Live/Work proposals are farcical with no evidence to support it. The proposal does not fit the current LCC Core Strategy or NPPF requirements for sustainability.
W22	Display boards lacking in content in overcoming previous objections to 2000-unit scheme. The emphasis placed on the Live/Work scenario is without foundation. The location of the site clearly fails to comply with the aims of the 'walkable Neighbourhood'.

W23	Do not feel the application addresses issues of the previous application.
W25	The live/work scenario is misguided.
W27	The proposals are too large
W28	The proposals do not appear to have changed since 2000-unit scheme.
W31	1000 homes are twice the existing number of properties in Walton and Thorp Arch, 6 times the size of Church Fields. Indicative layouts are completely useless until physical site surveys have identified what contamination exists from former ROF uses. Live/work on site won't work. The location does not fit with the LCC Core Strategy nor NPPF for sustainability. Site is not Brownfield land.
W32	The proposals are injurious to the visual & practical amenities of this already over exploited area.
W34	Until the majority of houses are built, there will be no school, no medical surgery, no shops, and no transport. Existing services are full and could not cope.
W37	Not a sustainable development and will not fulfil the requirements of the LCC Core Strategy. It is remote from all services. Everyone living there will need a car to access anything. Scale of the site is enormous
W38	Unsustainable location- furthest corner of the Leeds district and no facilities. Site is isolated. The artist's impressions on the site do not show anything like 1000 houses. I counted circa 300 houses only.
W39	For sustainability the plans do not fit with the LCC Core Strategy or national requirements, and most of the site is brownfield, it is greenfield. There are sites at Wetherby near the junction with Walton Road that have been shown by LCC in consultation meetings with the public and which are far better located to support 1,000 homes and have far better road links.
W40	The site is unsustainable due to its remote location.
W35	Live work scenario won't happen

E25	UDP Plan for 1100 units was totally rejected on all factors.
E47	UDP found it unsustainable. The scheme does not meet planning criteria and should be withdrawn.
E57	Not sustainable as 2005 public enquiry report. Area needs more employment not housing.
E50	School not built until 300 houses built. The site cannot be made to be sustainable.
E78	Housing development in this location would be contrary to LCC development policy. The site was deemed unsuitable for residential development by the findings of the UDP public enquiry.

E83	I feel same problems are happening which happened to the 2000 home proposal. Too large, not sustainable. Congestion. Bridge wont cope. Not all Brownfield site. I am against this proposal.
E86	A housing scheme of this size is not sustainable for the local area.
e88	The site is unsustainable
E95	The development is completed oversized compared to surrounding villages. The site is not sustainable within the LCC core strategy.
E96	The site is not sustainable.
E100	Thorp Arch trading estate is not a suitable place for housing. Where is the intended population to work?
E106	Much too large a development for the surrounding area.
E107	The size of the scheme will completely overpower the village and will change character of area. The scheme does not accord with Leeds City Council 'core strategy'.
E78	Suggestion of more positive response if there is further downscaling of the proposals.
E13	Avoid residential development and concentrate on developing a high quality employment estate.

ENVIRONMENT

Ref no.	Comment
E63	Areas of proposed development are already designated areas of special importance by Ecological groups, rare plants, wildlife habitats etc. As local villagers we totally oppose this development.
E91	Contaminated land. Site is remote.
W5	Contaminated land and clearance will lead to the destruction of an EU designated ecology site.

W6	The ecological damage to flora including the ecologically important grasslands would be damaged.
W7	contamination needs to be dealt with properly which might not be financially viable.
W10	Environmental impact and carbon footprint of the additional car journeys will be enormous.
W12	Contamination is a major issue and one which needs to be dealt with appropriately, further, exposing contaminants to the air will endanger both the people who are working on the site and those living in surrounding villages.
W14	Construction of the site will be noisy, dangerous and unsightly, why should residents have to put up with noise and pollution for a considerable amount of time. A good proportion of the site is not brownfield and has never been built upon and therefore plants and animals will be destroyed.
W16	The site is not Brownfield - large areas which were formally developed have overgrown and reverted back to nature. To avoid damage to ecology site surveys must be performed to identify and remove contamination from the former ROF.
W18	Contamination is a big concern - A resident of Boston Spa's Father died, whilst feeding his cattle, due to remaining explosive material on the site.
W20	A scape of contaminated areas would destroy any flora & Forna, and worries about children venturing onto sites which have not yet been remediated and finding contaminated materials.
W21	Earthworks to clean site up will destroy ecology. Most of the site is not Brownfield land and some has never been developed and is still virgin farmland. Site possibly contaminated as a result of wartime activities.
W26	The air pollution from the traffic alone will be hideous
w28	Not addressed the dreadful contamination of asbestos and explosives.
W29	Destruction of wildlife currently residing within the meadow and woodland.

W31	<p>we don't want the remediation scape material being driven out the site and through our villages. Can the roads surrounding the site cope with the aggregated weight of these loads? Where will the loads be taken out away from the site?</p> <p>The site is not brownfield, it is virgin land. The site includes the largest area of calcareous grassland - this must be protected.</p>
W32	High risk of humans contracting Cancer along with high toxicological health risk to humans, ecosystems, water and air quality.
W34	Land must be assessed and decontaminated - very costly. Increased car usage and traffic = pollution
W37	Site contains a large area of Magnesian limestone grassland which is a BAP habitat and is ecologically extremely valuable. This site is not Brownfield land. The process of clearance of the known contaminants on site would devastate on site ecology.

W38	I find it hard to envisage how development could begin without a full examination of the site. How and where would the contaminated material be processed?
W40	The site is only 30% Brownfield - much of the site has never been developed and many of the original buildings have been demolished with large areas of the land returned to nature. Ecological damage will occur when remediating the contaminated land which is unacceptable given the significant importance of the calciferous grasslands.
W41	Most of the site is not Brownfield Land
W35	The pre-existing contamination from the former use as a ROF and the cost to remediate this have been downplayed significantly. Site is not brownfield and will lose ecological grasslands etc.
E25	Contamination is a concern.
e72	The remedial scrape material will need to be moved from site - how?
E36	Site is not safe and includes land which was never used in the war - must be investigated thoroughly.
E41	Drainage needs to be sorted. Need to protect green areas.
E50	Contamination issue not discussed.
E52	Site looks to be anything but Brownfield.
E86	No recognition of the dangers. You are destroying areas of wildlife.
E95	Contamination material - what route proposed? We don't want this through our village.
E96	Land contamination.
E100	Contamination - fully addressed?
E106	Very worried about depth of soil removal.

HOUSING	
Ref no.	Comment
E2	So long as housing addresses the need for affordable homes for the young people in the area. Do not want mansions.
E19	Fully opposed to any housing development on this site. The sheer size of the proposed development is totally inappropriate to the area. This is an unacceptable proposition.
E30	No issue with planned development. Concern is planned highway numbers in and out of the site + demand to cope with extra households using them.
E39	Building a town on a village will destroy the profile of the area - share the burden of the housing shortage over the whole area.

E49	If the development goes through there must be at least 30% of housing allocated for social housing.
E51	If you actually give a toss about the views of residents, can I suggest you respect their concerns and reflect upon the harm that your unsustainable and unwanted development will cause to the local community.
E87	I do not like it - it ruins where we live (age 6).
E105	A helpful presentation, style and layout of village development is encouraging. The principal concern is traffic. More options must be considered for entry and exit points.
E5	Overprovisions of large houses here, new build should be varied

ECONOMY	
Ref no.	Comment
e1	The business on here would be able to thrive
W10	Insufficient local employment to sustain a population of the size that will be housed on this site.
W34	Very little employment locally so roads to Leeds, Harrogate and York will be congested.
e17	Site is not appropriate for housing. Its use for employment has been long established
E39	Rockspring concentrate on improving retail/commercial offer of this site and safeguard the jobs ultimately expanding the employment available here.
E73	I believe the site is allocated employment. I most strongly object.

FACILITIES & SERVICES	
Ref no.	Comment
E25	New village will over dominate existing T A village. Bus subject with subsidies could be a financial problem.
E93	A care centre would be great for the local area. Where would the new residents access healthcare?
W5	The site is remote and lack of infrastructure and access means it will be a car dominated commuter dormitory. Apart from a primary school, residents will have to travel to Wetherby and Boston Spa for essential services. It is unclear when the school will be built.
W24	Too many houses which will not be supported by existing infrastructure.

W35	Local services such as schools and GP Practices are already under extreme pressure with little room for expansion. No provision at the senior school level.
E41	Doctors, schools, and local shops will become overwhelmed.
E61	Plan does not address addition of people trying to get in at doctors, dentists. When will school be built.
E70	I'm still unable to get into my local dentist on NHS as it is full.
E88	The GP surgery is struggling to cope with the additional population.
E89	Doctors are oversubscribed. Effect on communities and on environment.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS, PRINCIPLE	
Ref no.	Comment
E1	Fantastic idea, breathe life into our trading estate. All for it, full support.
E35	Not enough actual information. All proposals, ideas did not say the actual footprint of houses. No info on school size.
E52	The location as far away from Leeds as it is possible to be with LCC makes the likelihood of increased traffic and infrastructure being inadequate to cope.
E56	The proposals appear incomplete.
E58	Totally unacceptable development in every way and simply should not be allowed.
E66	I have seen nothing in presentation to convince me that this is nothing other than a last ditch attempt to maximise the asset value in the site.
E110	There have been several plans over 16 years that we know of - is it not time it was put to bed.
E111	I feel that this site is part of the important wartime historic heritage of this area. This plan is destructive and cannot be allowed to go ahead.
E112	I dread to think of the effect that this new development would bring. It is utterly unsuitable for such a large development
E118	Cloud cuckoo land - good luck.
W2	As a consultation event it was insufficiently inclusive for working people, being held on a week day and finishing at 8pm. Should instead have been held on a weekend day to meet the needs of working people unable to attend the weekday event.
W3	The answer is to build a village north of Wetherby with an easy link road to the A1 and Wetherby.

W17	I never received any information from yourselves regarding the date and venue of your exhibition. This I understand, was promised. As I live in the centre of Thorp Arch Village I don't think my letterbox could have been missed.
W23	Moved to the area 3 years ago and since this time development has been at the back of the property, and now hear that HCA are going to build next to the library - we are constantly at the mercy of profit making companies who do not care for the local residents.
W25	Years of misery for locals with site construction.
W33	The Land Trust is a national charitable body first set up by the then English Partnerships (now Homes and Communities Agency) to hold and manage public open spaces on behalf of local communities in perpetuity. Initially the Trust was involved primarily with those spaces created as part of the National Coalfields Regeneration Programme where the local authorities in question were reluctant to adopt directly but still maintained a vested interest in their continued development and the benefits that they could
	provide for both existing and new communities alike. In the last 4 or 5 years since becoming an independent charity however, the Trust has also increasingly worked with the housing sector specifically. Also increasingly worked with the housing sector specifically, where we are seen to offer a unique solution and safeguards for both developers (providing a secure, sustainable long-term solution to green space stewardship, potentially using service charges etc.) and the local community (ensuring the value of the green space assets are maintained and enhanced whilst also enabling local people to be fully involved with their management in line with our charitable objectives).
e45	No new ideas put forward since last disastrous scheme was rejected.