

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Site Allocations Plan](#)  
**Subject:** PDE01180\_Leeds Site Allocation Plan consultation  
**Date:** 15 November 2015 20:31:23

---

Mr David Entwistle  
6 Moorland Crescent,  
Menston,  
Ilkley  
LS29 6AF

15<sup>th</sup> November 2015

RE: THE SITE ALLOCATION PLAN SECTION HG2-1 (3026) NEW BIRKS FARM INGS LANE, GUISELEY

I do not believe New Birks Farm Ings Lane, Guiseley is suitable for housing development, and I do not consider the Leeds Site Allocation Plan to be sound. I do not feel the plan is effective mainly for the following reasons,

- URBAN SPRAWL and loss of Greenbelt  
I believe that by building on the Ings lane site the divide between Guiseley and Menston will be breached and the conurbations will then join which is one the main purposes of greenbelt land (1. to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, 2. to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another).  
The land is Grade 3 agriculture land and should be preserved.

I do not feel Leeds City Council have done a comprehensive Green Belt review as required by the inspector of the core strategy. Therefore I do not believe this plan is justified. I do not feel Leeds Council have looked for enough brownfield sites before green belt the 5<sup>th</sup> official greenbelt purpose.

- CONGESTION  
Taking a short trip today (Sunday 15<sup>th</sup> November) from one side of Guiseley to the other side, I averaged 7.5 miles per hour, and it took 20 minutes to drive through the town. This level of congestion is typical and is noticeably worse now than it ever has been. This is due to many local developments over the last 10 years in both Leeds and Bradford – developments by both councils affects this area and here is no communication between the two districts to assess jointly the effect on the area. Trains at rush hours are full with virtually no standing room left.  
I don't believe this area would grind to a standstill if the proposed developments went ahead. I do not believe the plan has been positively prepared as no real assessment of extra traffic has been undertaken for the area as a whole.
- FLOODING  
The site is prone to regular severe flooding from the beck (see attached photos from today; I also have some photographs from previous floods if you should require them). I am very concerned if this site was built upon my property would be flooded as there would be nowhere for the water to run off to. Planners at meetings were dismissive of this very real risk.
- TRAFFIC ON THE A65  
Given the increase housing in Guiseley and Menston (which is not considered in the allocations) I believe increasing housing just off the A65 would be a disaster as the road is already very slow/stopped especially at weekends as well as rush hour. From Moorland Crescent it is often a lengthy process to turn onto the A65. I do not feel a sustainability appraisal has been undertaken for this site.
- ACCESS TO SCHOOLS & FACILITIES  
The plan has not been positively prepared as there are not enough facilities to cope with

the number of houses proposed in the area. For example although school places have expanded for primary school in Guiseley central to meet the currently projected children new houses have not been considered, places at schools in the north of Guiseley e.g. Tranmere Park have not increased at all. Given this will be the closest school for these new houses I am concerned places will be unavailable. I do not feel the community was fairly or adequately consulted as to where school places should be and plans for future housing has not even been considered. I am also concerned that secondary school places will not be available given the size of development both in Guiseley and Menston which is not considered as it is in Bradford's Council area. I do not believe the two councils have consulted enough to make a cohesive plan. The joint impact of developments from Leeds and Bradford does not appear to have been considered, making the plan unsound.

- Doctors and dentists are already stretched in the area – no plan is available to address this

- ECOLOGY

I am concerned with the loss of habitat for the birds, deer (on occasion), ecology, cows and rare crayfish in the stream.

Recently we have experienced problems with sewage flowing down the stream; this problem would be increased further with more homes putting strain on crumbling sewers.

This site was identified in the Leeds Habitat Network as a home of diverse fauna.

Given the target of 70000 houses for Leeds is aspirational perhaps Leeds city council should revise their figures and reduce the amount of green belt lost. I believe the plan should have used brownfield first.

Yours sincerely

David Entwistle

Photographs of today's flooding on site HG-2-1 (3026) New Birks Farm Ings Lane Guiseley

David Entwistle | Infrastructure Engineer | Equifax UK

p: [REDACTED]  
m: [REDACTED]  
e: [REDACTED]

Equifax Ltd, Augustus House, 3 New Augustus Street, Bradford, BD1 5LL

Equifax Limited is registered in England with Registered No. 2425920. Registered Office: Capital House, 25 Chapel Street, London NW1 5DS. Equifax Limited is authorised and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority.

Equifax Touchstone Limited is registered in Scotland with Registered No. SC113401. Registered Office: 54 Deerdynes View, Westfield Park, Cumbernauld G68 9HN.

Equifax Commercial Services Limited is registered in the Republic of Ireland with Registered No. 215393. Registered Office: IDA Business & Technology Park, Rosslare Road, Drinagh, Wexford.

This message contains information from Equifax which may be confidential and privileged. If you are not an intended recipient, please refrain from any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of this information and note that such actions are prohibited.

If you have received this transmission in error, please notify by e-mail [postmaster@equifax.com](mailto:postmaster@equifax.com).