

From:
To: [Site Allocations Plan](#)
Subject: PDE00035_Leeds Local Development Framework(Local Plan),Site Allocations Plan & Aire Valley Leeds Area Action Plan-Publication Drafts
Date: 25 September 2015 13:49:52

1. In July I emailed you with my objections to the Draft Site Allocations Plan. Having now visited the exhibition of the Publication Draft many of my objections still remain although I see that my objection to the inclusion of Site 1311B on the grounds of urban sprawl has been heeded and excluded from the Publication Draft.

2. However, I note with great concern that the Publication Draft proposes both housing and a school on Site 1311A. That Draft indicates a site for 83 houses on Sites 1180, 1311A and 2163A collectively. It is not clear whether the proposal is for 83 housing units AND a school or a school and a lesser number of houses or simply a school for all those three Sites. A public bridleway crosses between Sites 1311A and 1180A.

Any of the proposed uses are inappropriate for those Sites.

3. The reasons for this are:-

3.1 The Sites are currently Green Belt. National Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance notes issued under it indicates there is a fundamental aim of preventing urban sprawl and keeping open land permanently open and retaining the characteristics of openness and permanence. Any development of these Sites contravenes those fundamental aims.

At least four of the guiding principles of this National Policy are breached as:

- it results in unrestricted sprawl of a large built up surrounding area;
- the safeguarding of the countryside from encroachment is broken;
- it creeps towards the neighbouring Bradford MDC boundary lower down those fields and Old Hollins Hill; and
- it does not assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land within the area of Leeds City Council.

3.2 The Sites are on the outermost edge of the Silverdale Estate (which includes the Bransdale Estate). That Estate has approximately 400 houses. Only ONE formed and metalled road - Silverdale Avenue - gives vehicular access to those houses from Park Road. Park Road leads between the A65 and the A6038. Therefore anyone travelling by vehicle to/from the Estate from/to Leeds, Bradford or elsewhere MUST use Silverdale Avenue.

Silverdale Avenue is approximately 18 feet wide at its entrance from Park Road. Residents' cars can and do park on either side of it. Those residents have nowhere else to park as they have no rear access/garage and very few have parking space within their front garden. On most days turning right from it onto Park Road involves a long delay for a clearance in traffic. At rush hour this can be as long as 10 minutes, especially when traffic on Park Road is at a standstill because of queueing traffic at the A65 junction which is controlled by traffic lights. This often results in gridlock with traffic backing along all the surrounding roads.

To add further traffic by additional housing (or worse still, a school) would result in gridlock more frequently and for longer periods. The traffic movements associated with a school at this Site will swamp the surrounding road network and Silverdale Avenue in particular. A perfect example of the likely impact on the road network already exists at Guiseley school. The roads around there are clogged.

The traffic on Park Road is so bad where I live - at 85 Coach Road - we are now getting mothers parking outside on a morning and in the afternoon to walk their children along the footpath and old railway line to Westfield and St Peter and Paul's schools so that they don't have to travel through Guiseley.

3.3 The Publication Draft for Site 1180A includes a comment that Coach Road (currently an unmade and unadopted road with deep ruts) to Silverdale Mount requires reconstruction to a suitable standard and offered for adoption.

How? Such a statement is naive.

This road is privately owned by individual frontagers. Unless they can all be persuaded to sell the parts of the road they each own or the entire stretch compulsorily purchased access along it, let alone its reconstruction, would be prohibited.

4. Site 1113 should also not be considered for housing for the following reasons:-

4.1 it is currently allotments. It is one of the few allotment sites in Aireborough. As such it is green space. Its development would deprive local residents who own/lease the individual allotments a recreational facility. Contrary to the statement in initial Draft Plan the allotments are not disused.

The Publication Draft now suggests that half the Site should be allocated for housing. That will lead to pressure on the remainder to also be used for housing in the longer term.

4.2 use for housing would increase traffic in Aireborough and in particular on Silverdale Avenue(see point 3.2 above).

4.3 the Draft Plan acknowledged there is a deficiency of 0.06 ha in the provision of allotments in Guiseley. Why increase that deficiency? It is pointless providing allotment space elsewhere within the Council's area for those displaced from this Site as that would increase traffic movements and possibly cause parking problems elsewhere.

5. Possibly the biggest point of concern is that the cumulative impact of all the housing proposals contained in the Plan will have on public transport and the road network in the area. The A65, A6038 and Park Road are often at a standstill-and not just at rush hour.

The Publication Draft touches on this and in relation to the A65 corridor suggests"improvements including Horsforth roundabout". No further details are given. Additionally the Publication Draft acknowledges that in relation to Site 1221 that the Micklefield Lane/A658 junction is already congested. If a further 1000+ houses are added to Aireborough that congestion will be dramatically increased.

Already the public transport infrastructure is insufficient to cope with demand. Guiseley railway station is packed at both ends of the working day. The platforms at the station are not long enough to accomodate longer trains. Overcrowding is such a problem that many commuters drive from Guiseley to Menston(and so create traffic and parking problems there)simply to ensure they can board a train to work yet still end up standing for the entire journey.

The additions of new stations at Apperley Bridge and Kirkstall Forge will add to overcrowding on journeys from Leeds and passengers are almost certain to struggle boarding already overcrowded trains into Leeds.

Not only is there an overload of the transport system likely, there will also be a massive strain placed upon other elements of infrastructure such as doctors and dentists. Many already have full patient lists. Two schools in the area have recently been extended but an increase in population from the houses the Plan envisages will result in further need to expand all of those areas.

6. Both Guiseley and Yeadon will lose their separate identities. The boundaries between the two townships will simply blur into a continuous line of houses. Massive chunks of the green belt will be lost forever. This is contrary to Central Government Policy and planning guidance

Overall the proposals should be rejected in their entirety for the reasons stated above.

P R Darfield

85 Coach Road Guiseley LS20 8AY