From:

Sent: 28 March 2014 17:42

To: LDF Consultation

Subject: 'core strategy'

Dear Sir/Madam, my comments.....

First and foremost – re Steeton, where I live. This `lovely little village` – which it was, when I first moved here in the 80s; has now expanded out of all recognition. My particular part of it, near Thornhill Road has pretty well doubled in size now, especially with the recent development of 200 homes. Local services are really struggling to cope e.g. local surgery. It's really difficult to get an appointment now. Local children cannot be accommodated at the local school, and the traffic is increasingly horrendous. Goodness knows what the sewerage system is going to do! The point I wish to make, first and foremost is this.. Steeton has done far more that its fair share in providing new housing. Give us a break now, and stop eating up our green fields!

It is just not fair now. Your strategy quotes, 'Local Growth Centres (Steeton is one) are settlements that could expect a lower number of new homes than the principal towns. The plan is to allow 6,100 homes in these Local Growth Centres over the period. These are settlements that can grow in a relatively sustainable way with the right investment.' Steeton is not growing "sustainably" now! The draft states, "Transport links, the existing settlement pattern and facilities, the balance of the community, and how much land could be made available have all been considered. The aim is to help make communities more sustainable, in part by increasing the supply of affordable homes, but also by giving local facilities a boost". But take transport, the local railway has no parking left! Rail link facilities have long past 'sustainable'! Steeton residents NOW cannot take their cars to use the train. And some of us live a mile away from the station, and cannot walk this distance, or carry heavy bags after shopping. PLEASE CONSIDER WHAT IS FAIR FOR STEETON. We have give up far too many green fields already!

Our hard won greenbelt land is disappearing at an alarming rate. This is just not right. Brownfield sites have to be the priority, and the process of utilising this land has to be accommodated as helpfully as possible by planners.

Please hear these comments. Thank you, Walker, Steeton. BD20