



"Mike Willison"
<mjw@willison.demon.co.uk
>
19/06/08 16:33

To <nrwdpd@jacobs.com>
cc "Laura Pilgrim" <Laura.Pilgrim@leeds.gov.uk>
bcc
Subject NRWDPD Issues and Alternative Option

For Follow Up:  Normal Priority

For the attention of Nicky Leggatt

This response is made on behalf of the Leeds Local Access Forum (LLAF)

The LLAF was established under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 to advise the local authority 'as to the improvement of public access to land in that area for the purposes of open-air recreation and the enjoyment of the area, and as such other matters as may be prescribed'.

When formulating and giving advice the LLAF has to have regard to:

- the needs of land management
- the desirability of conserving natural beauty (ie flora, fauna, geology and anything relating to natural features of the earth's surface, including land formation, climate and distribution of flora and fauna
- guidance from the Secretary of State.

Public Access and recreation can be affected by development planning, for example changes of the use to which land is put may change the amenity enjoyed by access users of that land or adjoining land. The LLAF therefore is interested in the LDF process as regards the Core Strategy, about which it has commented, and site specific allocations of land. In regard to the latter point the LLAF would need to address the following:

- does a site specific allocation potentially impact on access, whether on CRoW Access Land or public rights of way, resulting in more or less access being available?
- does a site specific allocation potentially impact on the quality of the experience enjoyed by public access users, whether on an area or linear basis, resulting in more or less access being available?
- for any site specific allocation are there any safeguards which could be adopted to maintain access or the quality of experience of access users?

As regards the present consultation, most of the issues at this stage are very broad such that the LLAF is unable to comment except in the general sense outlined in the 3 bullet points immediately above. The LLAF would hope to make a fuller response at the preferred options stage when there are specific site allocations. However, the LLAF is able to make comment on specific issues as follows:

Issue 18

Option 1 Yes 2=
Option 2 Yes 2=
Option 3 Yes 5
Option 4 Yes 1
Option 5 Yes 6
Option 6 Yes 4

Issue 31

Yes

The LLAF agrees with the supporting text at paragraph 5.5.

Hope these comments are helpful.

Please keep the LLAF informed about the next stage of the consultation via Laura Pilgrim, the LLAF Secretary.

Dr Mike Willison
Chairman, Leeds Local Access Forum
35 Church Wood Avenue
Leeds
LS16 5LF

Tel: 0113 230 6259