

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Site Allocations Plan](#)
Subject: PDE01188_Site 4020/HG2- 4 Hawkstone Avenue/Hollins Hill
Date: 15 November 2015 20:25:07
Attachments: [Final Objection 3.doc](#)

[10 Park Lane](#)

[Guiseley](#)
[Leeds](#)
[LS20 8EP](#)

Tel: [REDACTED]

15 November 2015

Your Ref: Site 4020/HG2- [4 Hawkstone Avenue/Hollins Hill](#)

Dear Sir/Madam

Reference: Objection to Site 4020 Inclusion in the List for Possible House Building by Leeds City Council (LCC)

I have lived with my husband and two young children on Park Lane for 14 years and have studied the implications of the proposal to build houses on site 4020, I have also taken advice on this issue. I consider site HG2-4 (Site 4020) to be entirely unsuitable for house building for statutory, technical, economic, planning, and declared public policy reasons. I live adjacent to the site.

In the Strategic Housing Land Area Assessment (SHLAA) this site was once classed an amber site with issues it still has those issues and more, and those still unexamined issues should remove it entirely from the list.

Green Belt

Currently the site is green belt and should remain so, as it fulfils the 5 reasons for having the green belt in the first place, nothing has changed in this respect.

1. Restricting Housing Sprawl

Should this site be built on the whole landscape or prospect of the area between the Hawkstone Estate and the Tranmere Park Garden Estate would be ruined for ever, and the Design Statement applying to Tranmere Park would be shown to be of little value, yet again showing that the protection of the rural environment, declared green belts, and design statements are of little practical value. Presently the two estates merge and blend well with the green rolling and undulating landscape sector between them, you hardly realize the estates are there. Any building up to the A6038 will totally ruin the present, building to green landscape blending.

It should be remembered that if site 4020 is sacrificed to an unnecessary housing development then precisely what green belt is supposed to stop will have occurred – urban housing sector sprawl. Further the development of site 4020 will inevitably lead in a short time to the development of the field at the other side of the A6038 because any restraint for such a policy over the last 70 years will have been demolished by the actions of Leeds City Council planners. I say this because

the business situation involving site 4020 and the land across the A6038 is the same. Both sites are owned by Bradford City Council (BCC) and Leeds City Council is the planning authority for both sites. If permission is given for site 4020 it will then be virtually impossible to prevent the final filling in of this very old, existing and welcome, greenbelt buffer sector zone.

The green belt itself as well as the land flow and slope forms an almost natural transition between the two estate design types, avoiding any visually unpleasant clash to the eye that is so evident in some urban settings.

2. Prevention of Urban Merge

To encroach further on the land would also tend to cause the merging of Leeds and Bradford, as BCC have already built factories extensively on farm fields along the Aire valley in the direction of Guiseley (a strange policy when they have so many old brown factory sites). Strip development will occur along the Bradford Road (A6038) and perhaps and ultimately up Hawksworth Lane to the Greenfield Avenue estate next to the Bradford Golf Club entrance and building.

3. Safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

This site is a clear cut case of saving the countryside from encroachment. Being realistic, in any geographical setting between an urban and rural environment an interface of transitional change must and does take place. Usually around our cities and towns this is in the form of little used or completely unused derelict agricultural land that has been abandoned to the outward growth of the city. This is not the case with site 4020 as it is a working tenant farm that forms an actual boundary between the still outer semi rural Guiseley and the truly rural hinterland of the Hawkstone Farm area leading on over and up towards Baildon Moor.

4. Preserving the setting and special character of historic towns

This sub area of Guiseley is quite different and unique from the rest of the town in several important respects. It is sandwiched between the Guiseley conservation area which extends out from the town up to Park Gate House (circa 1730) which is a grade 2 listed building (Ref 1251079) and Tranmere Park Garden Estate which is now protected by a design statement. Also the field site 4020 is part of a very old farm whose close by (59m) farmhouse dates back to at least 1720 being listed grade 2 by Historic England, building number [1251070](#) and an adjoining early 18th century store number [1251071](#). The three components of the farm do compliment one another and really do form a natural and sensible barrier between town and country.

Close by Park Gate House was built by Jeremiah Marshall in 1730 and once had an extensive deer park facing the Aire valley, the boundary wall is still extant along Old Hollins Hill, and the near bye farm house probably pre dates the house by some 10 years. John Wesley founder of Methodism stayed at Park Gate House whilst on preaching tours in the district and one Lord Mayor of Bradford died in Park Gate House in the late 1800's; so this vicinity of Guiseley does have a rich historical past, deserving some preservation, in terms of greenbelt retention to preserve the historical setting and respect for in existent planning controls, that is a Conservation Area and a Design Statement.

5. To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict land and other urban land.

Here one can only say that this land is not derelict, to the contrary it is productive farm land that is actually used to rear cattle, it is not unused farm land as so often is the case with farm land adjacent to towns and cities. The inspector should please note that if this field is taken from the farm, which is the only convenient and level land the farmer can use, then increased farm traffic on surrounding roads would be the only way to keep the farm going. It is even possible that the farm would become uneconomic and lead to the rest of the farms land becoming agriculturally derelict – the opposite of what is wanted.

Soundness of the proposal

This proposal is not sound or justified because:

- Active farming land will be taken out of production. A study by the Ministry of Defence (MOD) (Global Strategic Trends - released July 3rd 2014) tells us that Britain produced 87% of its food in 1995, that figure has now dropped to 68%. MOD warn that over population, and climate change will likely cause food shortages within Britain in 20 years unless the complacency of ministers is overcome and action taken. Professor Tim Benton of Leeds University warned the UK government DEFRA committee that *"under some scenarios of change it might be difficult even to produce the same number of calories as we do at the moment"*
- The site is not positively planned because no systematic Housing Needs Survey has been undertaken by LCC so they don't know what type of housing if any Guiseley requires.
- It is well known that LCC total new housing numbers are grossly inflated and if brought to a Public Inquiry would probably be found to be wrong. This is because the highly suspect demographic study and process was based on old less accurate census data and other factors. Also comparison with other major city councils shows that they plan to build far less houses by 10 or 20 thousand than Leeds, even though they have higher population growths than Leeds.
- The infrastructure i.e. schools, doctors, dentists, roads can not cope with the additional population – try getting an NHS dentist in Guiseley or driving down Park Road to Leeds between [7.45 – 8.45 a.m.](#)
- If the site is developed; because of the need to redirect two high tension electricity cables, one of 55kV, site development costs will be higher than normal thus requiring high market value homes to be built on the site – not what Guiseley actually needs, that is to say smaller affordable homes.
- There are upwards of 20 brown field sites in LCC boundaries that should ideally be built on first - not green belt sites, so some negotiation should take place with builders on these sites before the sacrifice of 4020.
- Access from the A6038 to the site will be problematical as the crossroads near by are very busy and still do not have traffic lights (we have been waiting 10 years for these). Also towards the Shipley direction the Hollins Hill brow and chicane will give drivers very little warning should traffic pull out from this site onto the main road.

Since the site is publicly owned by Bradford City Council and controlled planning wise by LCC then a higher standard of respect for public policy and environmental control should be possible. Declared government guidance states that Green Belt should only be used for house building in **exceptional circumstances**.

· There are no exceptional circumstances here as LCC house targets are erroneously high and they have done no systematic study of housing in Guiseley, specifically they have not carried out a Housing Needs Survey in Guiseley.

Better uses of the site

1. The farm could be used once the long serving tenant retires by the council for educational use as a working farm to fulfil objectives of the National Curriculum.

2. The farm could be used as the first tenancy for young farmers wanting to start a career in agriculture. Farms in the possession of local authorities are too valuable as a community asset to be wasted on speculative house building projects by private builders.

3. At the very least this publicly owned land should be retained for sustainable community projects for the future. If in the future the land must be built on for any reason then perhaps a primary school or small health centre would be acceptable. What Guiseley needs is not more housing but infrastructure development to support the already existing population. Public infrastructure needs land and there is precious little public land left. Land is a finite and expensive resource and therefore we need to husband publicly owned land in a land bank for the future use of generations to come – a perfectly acceptable strategy and truly SUSTAINABLE PUBLIC POLICY.

Yours faithfully,

Mrs. D. Bellwood

Sent from my iPad