

From: [REDACTED]  
To: [Site Allocations Plan](#)  
Subject: PDE01191\_Leeds Site Allocation Plan Consultation  
Date: 15 November 2015 20:22:03

---

Entwistle  
Crescent,

Mrs Francesca  
6 Moorland  
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,

[if !supportLists]--> <!--[endif]-->FLOODING

The site is prone to flooding from the beck (see attached photos from today; I also have historic photos 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. The name Ings is an old Norse word referring to water meadows and marshes – hence even historically the wetness of this land has been noted. The land is Grade 3 agriculture land and should be preserved.

[if !supportLists]--> <!--[endif]-->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). Mire Beck has historically been the boundary between Leeds and Bradford and I believe this should remain.

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 consulted in the drawing of these plans at all, so do not believe these plans are positively prepared either. I do not feel Leeds Council have looked for enough brownfield sites before green belt the 5<sup>th</sup> official greenbelt purpose.

[if !supportLists]--> <!--[endif]-->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. I do not believe the plan has been positively prepared as no real assessment of extra

traffic has been undertaken.

[if !supportLists]--> <!--[endif]-->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 being in Bradford's Council area. I do not believe the two councils have consulted enough to make a co-hesive plan and the impact of increases in houses in both areas has not been considered, making the plan unsound.

[if !supportLists]--> <!--[endif]-->Doctors and dentists are already stretched in the area – no plan is available to address this

[if !supportLists]--> <!--[endif]-->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.

I do not feel Leeds City Council fulfilled their duty of community involvement in this process as I was only made aware of the consultation period by members of the Aireborough Neighbourhood Forum. Leeds City Council did not make me aware of the drop in sessions either.

Yours sincerely

Francesca Entwistle