

Issues This document is verbose and repetitive and we have chosen to put our comments under the following headings.

Housing This causes contentious issues in every village. Every new resident feels that their investment is key to the village and any future development is an unnecessary intrusion and does not sit with their vision of living in the countryside.

The committee has described Church Fenton as a linear village. It could be described as country-side sprawl. It is now impossible to carry on with linear development. If the village is to thrive and be a viable community some back filling will inevitably have to occur.

Low cost houses have been advocated and an emphasis put on this type of house. However, this cannot economically occur in small developments. It is impossible as some of the Committee have advocated to build low cost five bedroomed houses. There will also be a resistance amongst existing residents to have such properties adjacent to themselves. ( See also our comments regarding central Church Fenton)

#### Environmental and green spaces

With regard to Leeds East Airport which is in Ulleskelf parish, it may be beneficial to have some discussion. However our understanding is that this is a review of Church Fenton and therefore not in the remit of this Committee.

There are some inaccuracies within the documentation.

The committee states that most of Church Fenton farm land is within an NVZ. This is incorrect as the Environment Agency made several mistakes which have had to be corrected through the due legal process. Only land to the south of Church Fenton that drains into Carr dyke is in an NVZ.

Public Footpaths There are numerous footpaths in Church Fenton. Sadly, many users of these footpaths abuse their privilege. Dogs are allowed to rampage through valuable , growing crops and people do not keep to the allotted footpath.

As dogs have been allowed to roam free, this has decimated the wild life especially in Church Fenton Trans. This area is now bereft of any significant wild life. Speaking for ourselves we would be reluctant to contemplate any new footpaths until the community shows awareness, understanding and respect for the countryside and valuable growing crops. At present this is not the case.

### Green Spaces Church Field

The Committee seems to be advocating public trespass on what is private land. They should be encouraging proper use of the footpath and not free reign on a private field.

### Central Church Fenton

The Committee seem to have a “chocolate box” image of the older properties in this area. Whilst it might be desirable to preserve other peoples’ property, it is an extremely expensive undertaking to bring them up to modern day standards.

Over time Church Fenton has developed differing styles of the era. The Committee has to accept that modern building and construction will have to be implemented and consequently the designs and construction of yesteryear will not be a viable proposition. This will especially be the case if low cost housing is advocated. The older, cottagey style dwellings are very difficult to adapt to modern standards.

### HS2.

We are not sure that the Committee has completely understood the full impact of Phase 2b. It will entirely decimate the economic viability of Manor Farm and all farming lands to the north of Church Fenton village. The mighty viaduct running over the flood plain will destroy the views of Church Fenton to the north and west. The hideous proposal of an underpass running between Church Fenton and Barkston Ash is an astonishingly bad concept in very low- lying land and should be resisted at all costs. The earthworks and construction to the north and west of the village will be monumental and will practically maroon the village for years. It will have the greatest impact on Church Fenton village and its residents.

### Drainage and flooding

The Committee appear to want to use the flooding issue to decry development. Obviously, development should not take place on areas

known to flood. However, the major problems are with irresponsible builders who are allowed to build and develop areas and who do not make proper provision for surface water to drain, relying on ditches that were not designed for the flows of water from housing developments. Consequently farm land is now being flooded by these irresponsible activities. The builders should be compelled to rectify these problems before construction is allowed to commence. The Committee should advocate the complete renewal of the archaic surface water drainage system running through Church Fenton.

### Council Investment

Church Fenton Parish Council has lately invested a huge amount of borrowed money in the purchase of the Community Shop and the White Horse public house. There was major controversy in the village as many of the Parish Council wished to proceed with the purchase of the White Horse Public house and not the Community Shop.

### White Horse

The White Horse was purchased at a value above that recommended by the District Valuer and subsequently was developed into a gastro pub. This was not what the villagers expected and did not fulfill the aspirations and aims raised at the time of purchase. It is too expensive for many and has not provided significant employment for local people. The investment did not represent sensible usage of community funds and could be described as a reckless purchase which will now show a negative value and a drain on community resources for years to come.

### The Community Shop

In spite of opposition created by some members of the Parish Council the shop was purchased at a sensible price and has been enlarged, modified and modernised to make a magnificent community shop. This resounding success is down to the great enthusiasm of many volunteers who have devoted many hours to its development and consequently its success. Its value to the community has been especially demonstrated this past year by being a lifeline to members of the community. It is unfortunate that the Parish Council sought to disadvantage the shop financially for spurious, unnecessary reasons.

In our view the Parish Council should in future refrain from investing public money in large scale projects unless they are found to be of unquestionable viability. Sentiment should not count.

## Parking.

There are major issues with parking in the village. This is especially so when the railway station is functioning normally. Large areas around the station and Sandwath Lane are full of cars which restricts the free movement of agricultural and industrial traffic. If the railway is to prosper then more off street parking has become a necessity.

There are also parking issues around the school in the morning and afternoon where irresponsible parents abandon their cars. There are also problems caused by the mini roundabout and the traffic island adjacent to the White Horse public house. Removal of the traffic island and the mini roundabout would greatly assist in this area.

## Conclusion

In our opinion the plan has proved to be extremely expensive and in view of the limited results from the surveys feel that it is not a proper village consensus and therefore poor value for taxpayers money. We also feel that it has been compiled by a few people with vested interests and limited vision and does not give a sufficiently broad framework to be a fair and unbiased vision for the future of the village and therefore should not be adopted in its present state.