

**From:**  
**To:** [Site Allocations Plan](#)  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** PDE00820\_Re: Objections to Leeds Site Allocations Plan  
**Date:** 02 November 2015 19:33:31

---

From: John Lupton  
22 Silverdale Grange  
Guiseley LS20 8PX

## **Re: Objections to Leeds Site Allocations Plan**

### **Sites HG2-5 (2163a, 1180a, 1311a), Site HG2-6 (1113)**

This is to register my objections to the above Plan, which I consider not to be Sound. The grounds of my objection are as follows.

#### **The Plan has to be positively prepared**

There has been no assessment of local housing needs. The Plan seems to consist of "build more houses".

We have already seen hundreds of cookie-cut houses built on minuscule plots, costing an arm and a leg. Young people early in their careers would struggle to live here.

#### **Plan has to be justified**

The motivation seems to come from property developers rather than as a result of consultation between LCC and people who know the area.

As most employment is located in Leeds, sites closer to Leeds should be explored first.

#### **Plan has to be Effective**

There is already poor access to Coach Road, and too many houses for the one exit available on to Park Road, which is frequently queued.

There is mention of a school. As Guiseley Oxford Road and St Oswald's are already having extensions to cater for the increased demographic, a new school does not seem to have been factored in to these calculations. (We can probably dismiss this proposal as flim-flam from the developers, intended to curry favour).

## **Multiple breaches of NPPF**

Here are some examples. The Section numbers refer to the NPPF document.

### **S32-S38 Promoting Sustainable Transport**

Guiseley has its existing industries, but is mainly dedicated to retail. As such, much of the working population will commute to Leeds, maybe Bradford. The train service is reliable, but is short of passenger room at peak times. No provision, in the form of longer platforms has been made to accommodate longer trains. There must be a safe limit on the number heading into Leeds at any one time. As there are four stations prior to Guiseley, the trains at peak times are already crowded when they arrive. (S32)

As for commuting by car, every hundred families with just one worker will generate over half a kilometre of traffic. It already takes a long time just to leave Guiseley by road. Buses may be plentiful, but use the same facilities. There is no plan, or space, to upgrade the A65.

Developers nearby in Menston offered free rail passes for their homebuyers – this is not a solution if there is no corresponding infrastructure in place first.

### **S69-S78 Promoting healthy communities**

The Plan should take into account Community Needs and not just build houses. A community needs facilities. It has to be more than a dormitory town for Leeds. (S69)

As said, Guiseley Oxford Road and St Oswald's schools are already having to expand. It is more difficult to obtain doctor and dentist appointments. The impact of a large number of extra houses in the area would be unacceptable. I notice that schools and medical centres promised by developers for nearby sites such as High Royds have not been implemented. (S72)

A town needs open spaces. A development on Coach Road Fields involves filling in an open space. Green space, not necessarily parkland, is also important. (S73)

### **S79 – S92 Protecting Green Belt land**

A development on Coach Road Fields would be within about 200m of houses in Yeadon. This is adding to urban sprawl, not preventing it. (S79)

Coach Road Fields back on to Esholt Woods. These form a border between Leeds and Bradford. There appears to have been no co-operation between Leeds and Bradford with a view to conserving this designated ancient woodland. These are

bluebell woods, which take centuries to develop. (S83, S84)

## **S93 – S108 Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change**

Some of these fields, and the woods, contain watercourses, some underground, that cannot afford any more run-off from areas that have been built upon. They don't call the area "The Springs" for nothing. (S99, S100)

\* \* \* \*

### **Ecology and Landscape**

Coach Road Fields and Esholt Woods are a popular area used by walkers, dog owners, horse riders, families etc. This is one of the few places left where wildlife, even deer, can be seen so near a town.

A waymarked public footpath and bridle path run through it, and there is also a footpath through Springs Wood. This is a safe area free from motor traffic where children and dogs can run free. I have noted over the last few years that the extra human traffic has already caused some erosion of areas that were formerly green.

In brief, this valuable area needs careful management by Leeds and Bradford before it is allowed to go to wrack and ruin. I do not believe that the current Site Plan takes this into account.

### **Conservation and heritage**

All the Coach Road sites are designated Green Belt and Special Landscape Area. The Allotments would be better used to meet the demand for allotments.

And... not everywhere has to look like Leeds.

### **Highways and Transport**

There is only one exit from Silverdale, unless you own a 4x4 or don't care much for your car. The Park Road end of Silverdale Avenue was built before the era of cars, and as such there are parked cars on both sides of the road where the terraced houses are, making access difficult, more so for Emergency vehicles. This is not improved during the crown green bowling season when there are many more parked cars than usual. Another exit on to Park Road would not improve access, bearing in mind that traffic is usually backed up. I would also

expect the currently low crime rate to go up, as per any estate with "drive-through" capability. The former route over the railway bridge to Ghyll Royd is now a public footpath and Sustrans cycle path so I would not expect that to become accessible by car.

## **Develop a Sound Plan**

- Do a proper traffic survey. When the Bransdales (98 houses) were built in the 1970s, there was a traffic survey. This took place at 9:30, after most commuters would have left for work.
- Develop a workable Infrastructure Plan before planning further housing.
- Review availability of brownfield sites in and around Leeds, with a view to providing housing in the vicinity of employment
- It is generally known that the estimate of 70,000 new houses required in the Leeds area is based on flawed and out of date data. This needs to be reviewed and a lower target agreed
- Respect Guiseley as a community rather than an employment resource for Leeds-based jobs.
- Engage with the public at the outset, rather than presenting a fait-accompli that won't work and causes objections like this.
- Co-operate with Bradford Council regarding the management of land bordering both districts.

\* \* \* \*

Accordingly, I should be pleased if you would take the above objections in account in any future discussions regarding these sites.

Yours faithfully

John Lupton