

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Site Allocations Plan](#)  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** PDE00953\_Re Ings Lane site 3026 - Section HG-2-1. LDF Publication Draft Consultation  
**Date:** 16 November 2015 10:54:12  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)

---

Re Ings Lane site 3026 – Section HG-2-1 – New Birks Farm. C.300 houses planned.

I do not consider the Leeds Site Allocation Plan in general to be sound, or justified, and I also disagree with the Ings Site 3026 being used for new housing, being in an already congested area of the Aire Valley that has seen significant housing development already in the last 3-4 years.

Below is my response to the LDF Publication re the draft consultation, re the Leeds Allocation Plan as a whole:

- The plan is not sound – LCC’s sustainability appraisal has obviously not researched any of the sites to the required degree – there is no assessment of how each site will impact the community or how the new residents will access amenities. Equally, there is a lack of sufficient transport reviews or ecology reports. The proposed mitigations stated to alleviate subsequent road congestion on the A65 are out of date and ineffective.
- LCC have not done a green belt review as was asked for by the inspector of the Core Strategy. They have only reviewed green belt sites which were already selected for development.
- The plan is not positively prepared - I do not believe other planned site work in the immediate vicinity, which will need to use the same roads, schools, doctors surgeries and public transport, has been taken into account – Bradford Council currently have development work pending in Menston, for c.300 new houses. This is following the recent development of High Royds (c.350) houses immediately adjacent to Menston – less than 400 yards from the proposed Ings Lane site. Just 2 miles from Rawdon on the A65, Leeds Council (‘North’ site allocations) are also planning a huge development adjacent to Horsforth roundabout, for 777 houses (HG2-41 4240). All of the proposed Aireborough residential sites are on greenbelt - all will need to use the A65, which is already massively congested.
- LCC have not involved communities sufficiently in the drawing up of the plans - I do not think adequate consultation has been undertaken (for *any* of the planned sites around the Guiseley and Rawdon area). It feels very much like we as residents have been kept in the dark in the hope of pushing these plans through un-contested. This is not about Nimbyism – it is about protecting our greenbelt from irreparable damage, in an area that is already massively over-congested with struggling infrastructure. We live less than a mile away from several of these planned sites and have not been made aware of any of these proposed developments – the road I live on is even mentioned in the report related to the ‘cumulative effect on the A65/ Oxford Road junction’ – yet we have heard nothing about the plans or the consultation. It has only been through friends and family (and some very justified campaigning by community colleagues) that we even found out about it.

- Leeds have not done a housing needs survey – so it is possible (and likely) that developers will plan to build larger houses to create more profit. The ANDF emerging housing survey suggests the area needs affordable houses for first time buyers. The Menston Highroyds housing programme (c350 homes) has not addressed this issue, and neither will the planned Menston development (c.300). This issue was also not addressed by recent housing development on Netherfield road, which joins Ings Lane. Of 75 Bellway homes built, only 14 were 2-bed ‘first-home’ houses. Equally, the adjacent Redrow site’s cheapest property started at £265,000 – certainly not a starter home.
- Leeds Housing target of 70,000 homes has been described as aspirational – Revised ONS figures suggest a much lower figure of 44,500 is more appropriate – but LCC will not change their target even though Councillor Gruen admitted in a television interview that they conceded the figure should be nearer 60,000. A lower figure overall would reduce the burden on the green belt to meet the original plan.

Here are my formal challenges for the specific site plans for Ings Lane:

I believe that the case for this site, for an additional 298 houses in an already highly congested area of the aire valley, to be unjustified, unsound and has not been properly impact assessed.

- The Ings Lane development will go against 4 of the 5 official purposes of green belt. Development here will result in urban sprawl, and will result in the two named settlements of Guiseley and Menston merging with one another along Mire Beck. Not developing further housing here (in addition to the already developed High Royds location, and the additional 300 houses planned in Menston, less than ½ mile away) will help to safeguard the countryside from encroachment and will mean that Brownfield sites within Leeds will be regenerated by developers – as the easily prepared green belt will not be as easily available to them.
- No real assessment has been done on the access to each site, or the extra traffic it will create. I live on Oxford Road, Guiseley, and note the wording in your impact assesement of Site 3026 (page 43) – “there is a cumulative impact from this development on the A65/ Oxford Road junction”. This statement is made against almost all of the proposed Aireborough allocation sites. And the possible suggested ‘measures’ to mitigate ? -“ may take the form of contributions towards more significant measures such as improvements to Horsforth roundabout.”

If anyone from the site planning team had been to the area it would be clear that Horsforth roundabout has already been ‘improved’ this year, by adding multiple traffic lights and traffic filters to try and alleviate what is already a massively over congested road link. It is as ‘improved’ as it is going to get - It hasn’t worked. This will be made even worse by the 777 planned houses allocated for the fields adjacent to the Horsforth roundabout. (HG2-41 4240).

- The roundabout is c.5 miles away from the proposed Ings Lane site - So far away in fact that it’s *not even visible* on the Aireborough overview map on page 44. It isn’t even in

the same planning section and falls under a separate Leeds Council document entitled 'North Site Allocations Plan'. To suggest that improvements to this roundabout would in some way mitigate the building of hundreds of houses on the Aire valley greenbelt is staggeringly misjudged.

This is clearly not a proper assessment, and demonstrates a complete lack of understanding of the area and the impact these new sites would have. The suggestion to improve Horsforth roundabout is also massively out of date – it's already been done! And traffic there is still shockingly bad. This proves that these site proposals are unsound.

Here's a photo of the roundabout, in case you needed convincing (from an article in the guardian from 2011):



(yes those are cars queuing up the other side of the valley, around 2 miles away).

And Leeds council want to build another 777 homes here, just behind where the trees are on the right hand side.

Here's the guardian article from 2011 -

<http://www.theguardian.com/leeds/2011/mar/31/opinion-a65-what-s-the-solution-to-leeds-traffic-congestion>

You'll note how much it emphasises existing train over-crowding too, so the train line is also not a mitigating factor as trains are already overcrowded each morning.

Nowhere does the article suggest (as a possible solution) to build c.2000 more houses along its route.

- In the Leeds local plan, a comprehensive review of green belt should have taken place alongside Bradford – there is no evidence this has taken place. Only one meeting with Bradford city council is recorded in their September background paper.
- The impact on the greenbelt is plain to see when you look at the Aireborough HG2 allocations – all sites are planned on greenbelt, which will be excessively eroded should these plans go through. Here are the planned sites for HG2 – I hope the numbers here that are being allocated to greenbelt sites brings the issue home – across an area that is not much bigger than 3sq miles:

Phase 2					
Plan Ref	SHLAA Ref	Address	Area ha	Capacity	Green/Brown
HG2-1	3026	New Birks Farm, Ings Lane, Guiseley	10.8	285	Greenfield
HG2-2	3029	Wills Gill, Guiseley	5.1	133	Greenfield
HG2-3	1255B	Shaw Lane (land at), Guiseley and Banksfield Mount, Yeadon	8.9	234	Greenfield
HG2-4	4020	Hollins Hill and Hawkstone Avenue, Guiseley	3	80	Greenfield
HG2-5	1180A_1311 A_2163A	Coach Road/Park Road Guiseley	5.3	83	Greenfield
HG2-9	3366	Land at Victoria Avenue, Leeds	3.9	102	Greenfield
HG2-10	1221	Gill Lane, Yeadon LS19	5.9	155	Greenfield
HG2-12	4254	Woodlands Drive, Rawdon	4.9	130	Greenfield

- It is not realistic or justified to attempt to allocate 3% of the entire Leeds district wide target total to an area that is primarily greenbelt (Aireborough) – the 3 small towns of Rawdon, Guiseley and Yeadon - when only 6% of the district wide target has been allocated for the entire ‘North’ Leeds area, comprising the much larger areas of Chapel Allerton, Headingley, Holt Park, Horsforth, Kirkstall, Meanwood, Moor Allerton, Oakwood, Harehills, Hollins Park, Butcher Hill, Weetwood, parts of Moortown and Roundhay.

#### How LCC can make the plan sound:

- Reduce the Leeds housing target from 70,000 to 44,000 (as per ONS analysis)
- Abide by the National Planning Policy Framework
- Start the plan again with more focus on developing available brownfield sites first
- Have a more detailed infrastructure plan in place before the site allocations are drawn up
- Build closer to areas with better, less congested, infrastructure and transport links
- Engage properly with local communities
- Cooperate with other councils, such as Bradford, to ensure that areas adjacent to one another are not over-allocated for development (as is the case with the Ings Lane site)
- Council members visit these sites and the area to understand the impact this additional housing would have on the already congested existing transport links.

I would like acknowledgement of my response and to be informed of the submission of the plan for public examination and/ or the adoption.

Thanks  
Matt

DISCLAIMER. The contents of this email and its attachments are intended solely for the original recipients and express the views of the authors and not necessarily the Company. If you are not the intended recipient please delete without copying or forwarding and inform the sender that you received it in error.

Provident Financial Management Services Ltd, Registered in England, Company Number 328933. Interim Permissions Reference Number: 119219

Provident Personal Credit Ltd, Registered in England, Company Number 146091. Interim Permissions Reference Number: 002529

Both Provident Financial Management Services Ltd and Provident Personal Credit Ltd are authorised and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority, see Interim Permissions numbers above. Registered Office: No.1 Godwin Street, Bradford, West Yorkshire BD1 2SU, United Kingdom.

Please save paper - don't print this email unless necessary.