

**From:**  
**To:** [Site Allocations Plan](#)  
**Subject:** PDE01030\_Site Allocation Plans - objection  
**Date:** 16 November 2015 08:14:10

---

Dear Sir or Madam

I write to object to the contents of the site allocation proposals developed by Leeds City Council for the Aireborough area in particular, but most specifically with regard to site **HG2-10/1220** on the A65/Gill Lane.

I do not believe the plans themselves are being appropriately prepared - there is no clear justification, for example, for the figure of nearly 70,000 new properties for the city and in fact a figure of around 45,000 seems to be closer to actual demand. Further, when asked about this the City Council has been known to respond that this is a 'government' target despite the fact that central targets were, as I understand it, removed some years ago.

With regard to specifics, my comments below apply most particularly to site HG2-10/1220, which is adjacent to my home, but they also apply to the proposals as a whole which, I believe, are deeply flawed. I have three main reasons for saying this

First, the Aireborough district has seen the building of nearly 2500 homes in the past ten years - but yet transport infrastructure, schools, doctors and NHS dental provision has not changed: there is already an unacceptable squeeze on these. Transport links, and in particular the road network, is at absolute breaking point: for my own job I have little choice but to drive, but it is taking nearly an hour to drive five miles to the outskirts of Leeds (despite the 'improvements' to the Horsforth roundabout). This is without the effect of further properties being built. It is interesting to note that the traffic survey was done during the school half term - as if to deliberately understate the current position.

Secondly, the proposals almost exclusively propose building on green belt and green field land, and whilst there is a technical difference between the two the effect is the same. The site I am referring to would merge three areas (Nether Yeadon, Guiseley and Henshaw) making them indistinguishable to each other, If the farmland is removed, a former rural area would become just another urban sprawl. As I understand it, there has to be an exceptional circumstance to build on green land when brown field sites are available - but yet no such has been proposed. Of the 45,000 that might more reasonably need to be built in Leeds, around 40,000 could be built on brownfield sites.

Thirdly, the proposals fail to take any account of the impact of property decisions being made by the City of Bradford council. Further properties are already being built in Apperley Bridge, just a couple of miles away, with a major impact on the transport infrastructure to name but one impact - but, it would appear, this is ignored.

I would conclude by saying that I understand the need to build more homes - but there must also be a balance with maintaining the rural nature of this part of the world. These plans are not appropriately considered, the views of residents are being ignored, and I would hope you would see that they need to be rejected.

Yours sincerely  
Stewart Harper

7 Barfield Drive  
Leeds  
LS19 7SJ