

From:
To: [Site Allocations Plan](#)
Subject: PDE00251_Planning consultation Leeds SiteHG2-4 (4020)
Date: 25 October 2015 10:19:48

Dear Sirs

I am very disappointed with the scale of development proposed for Guiseley, 100% of which is on the green belt. We have a gridlocked town which has been a building site for the last 10 years. The plan is not sound at all, whilst some building is inevitable and indeed necessary how can you state a split of 65-35% on brownfield versus greenbelt and put out a plan for 100% greenbelt in this area. It conflicts with your own overview.

Regarding this particular site it is very small, unlike others it adjoins the main arterial road from Bradford the A6038 which means that the impact on the A65 you mention is relevant but this doubles it up, it's entirely unsuitable. There is also a main electrical cable running through it so there are a number of complications.

The plan shows the footpath as the boundary but no mention is made of the fact that the farm and surrounding land is ALL in Bradford. Mr King's family are still farming this land and have for almost 80 years. I would question whether it is positively prepared and even drawn correctly. All of the land is in Bradford except the greenfield, greenbelt field you refer to as 4020.

The most serious issue of all is UNRESTRICTED URBAN SPRAWL, and here's why.

- 1) There is a natural sweep of the land from Tranmere Park which will become disjointed by this development causing pressure to build on the field at the other side of the road to rebalance.
- 2) Contrary to the rules it is highly irregular because Bradford will join Leeds as a result of this proposal, exactly what are these rules there for?
- 3) Anything built here will tower over the street as the majority of houses are bungalows and the field has an incline beyond our boundary.
- 4) With so many different sites it detracts from the fact that any houses built here will be visible for 10 miles thus advertising that the whole valley right across to Apperley Lane is "open for business", it's the thin end of what will become a very big wedge.

Given Guiseley has no park to speak of there are many trails and a well used recreational wood leading into a conservation area in Esholt nearby.

Given this is a conservation area as stated in your plan then surely the clue is in the name. CONSERVE IT.

It requires removal and protection for future generations. It remains the one and only green lung left that separates Leeds and Bradford. Once it's gone then it has gone forever, as the population grows we need to maintain these buffers and not remove them.

Such a small site seems ridiculous but it's the long term picture that is of most concern here. The sprawl will come from the Bradford side and in no way does that alter your obligations to maintain and prevent this from occurring. It's a cherry picking exercise because it would make the most money and that is all. This relatively small amount of housing could be accommodated in many other places, the bottom of Yeadon Moor would be one example, as land that is unused should always be selected first.

The plan is not positively prepared as no housing survey has been carried out locally and any weight given to all the other creaking facilities with regards to the roads,schools,doctors etc.Housebuilders build houses and have no interest in infrastructure.

Many have admitted that the total figure of 70,000 was plucked out of thin air and a more realistic figure is 40-50,000,still an awful lot.

The plan as it stands is unjustified,Guiseley could do with a moratorium to adapt to the influx of people that are coming in as I write.It seems like a race to concrete the entire A65 route as soon as possible.

Leeds needs to abide by the NPPF and protect the greenbelt,liaising with Bradford council (a duty to cooperate) seems to not have been done either.

A lot of the plan is fine,but the loading on Guiseley is not in accordance with your own ruies and this must be reviewed.

I also spoke to Mr Feeney recently and he described the timeframe as open ended,only that phase 1 had to come before phase 2.I am as a result none the wiser and would suggest the phasing is timetabled clearly for everyone to understand.

Many thanks,

Yours Sincerely

A.B. Broughton,58,Hawkstone Avenue,Guiseley,LS 20 8ES