

From:
To: [Site Allocations Plan](#)
Cc:
Subject: PDE01476_LEEDS Site Allocation Plan
Date: 15 November 2015 12:25:39

Leeds Site Allocation Plan Consultation

Part 1

From Mrs Christine Pearce, 46 Silverdale Drive, Guiseley, Leeds LS20 8BE.

Part 2

2.1 My Comments relate to Leeds Site Allocations Plan

2.2 a The Specific Site: Coach Road fields HG2-5 (1180, 1311 and 2163)

I do NOT agree with the proposed use of the site.

The themes I wish to comment on are Loss of Green Belt and Highways and Transport.

Part 3

3.1 I do NOT consider the plan to be sound.

3.2 My comments are about Justification and Positive Preparedness.

3.3 Not Justified

The Council has not revised its house building target since its Core Strategy, the figure for the number of new houses needed would be a lot less if more up to date figures from the Office of National Statistics are used.

The site is in the Green Belt, when it is built on it is gone forever. It is part of an area designated by Leeds council as a Special Landscape area. The footpaths/bridleways alongside the site give access to open countryside, presently I can walk from my home without any need to negotiate a housing estate or skirt

school fields. The NPPF says that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances.

If it goes ahead it may lead to unrestricted sprawl of housing into agricultural land. Leeds and Bradford could potentially merge if there is no joined up thinking. Has Leeds Council done any work with the neighbouring authority, Bradford to see if they have plans for the area up to the boundary?

Coach Road would have to be used for access but is not adopted and is not very wide in places. Even if it were surfaced the width between existing properties is unlikely to provide safe access for children to walk to a new school and have 2 lanes of passing cars. Coach Road exits onto Park Road where traffic is at a standstill at many times of day. Currently when trying to exit Silverdale Avenue you are dependent on consideration from other road users, particularly if turning right. Coach Road would mirror this situation and if a school were added at start and end of school day it would be gridlocked as it is a fantasy that parents would walk their children to school.

The traffic from Leeds on the A65 crawls along to enter Park Road because of Guiseley retail park and Morrison's car park entrance. Adding a school would bring more cars and potentially make it impossible for an emergency services vehicle to reach into Silverdale estate. A fire engine could be on the Guiseley gyratory coming from Rawdon use the "wrong side" of the road at some points but not make it through the pedestrian crossing on the exit of the gyratory or be able to use the wrong carriageway due to stationary traffic in all directions. An alternative approach on the A65 from Ilkley by an ambulance for example would also meet standing traffic in both directions along Park Road itself.

I recently made a 75 mile journey to return home, the first 74 miles took 1 hour 55 minutes however, when I arrived at White Cross the last mile took 15 minutes due to stationery traffic on both the A65 and Park Road. The A65 route has already absorbed traffic from the new housing at High Royds site, Menston and a former factory sites on Netherfield Road, Guiseley. A former mill complex on Springfield Road, Guiseley is now going to add more cars to the road as it is

being developed for more houses.

The Site Assessment suggests traffic calming is put in place on Silverdale estate, this is unnecessary as Silverdale Avenue has so many parked cars it is in effect "calmed" already, those residents have no off road parking to use. The estate roads are not straight and have plenty of parked cars invariably on bends to be negotiated even during the working day.

Leeds as a city has sites which have been discounted for housing for example brownfield site MX2-7 has been identified for mixed use but could be housing. Has Leeds council looked at any sites closer to the motorway network and employment in the city centre for example along the Geldard Road corridor?

3.3 Not Positively Prepared

The increase in residents would mean more requirements for healthcare at surgeries, hospitals and in the community but there is no mention of a developer including a new surgery on the site. The needs of the existing residents of Silverdale estate have not been looked at. When a resident has to commute to Leeds for work their options are to use an overcrowded train from Guiseley station if they haven't found that the new designated "station car park" on Netherfield Road is full or to drive along the congested A65. If housing is added along that route between the Rawdon Crematorium and the Outer Ring Road as is proposed, the whole journey becomes a slow crawl along this traffic corridor which is already at capacity from Menston to the city centre. A particular trouble spot is from White Cross, Guiseley to the West Side retail park, Guiseley which causes congestion on the adjacent streets. The existing residents are in effect trapped in the estate as the only exit is via Silverdale Avenue onto gridlocked Park Road/A65.

There is no site on the SAP local to Coach Road that is identified as suitable for employment so the householders would end up adding to the traffic on the A65, commuting into Leeds for employment.

The council's own document for HG2-5 says that it is suitable for older persons housing/independent living in accordance with Policy HG4. It goes on to say that Coach Road from Park Road to Silverdale Mount should be reconstructed to a suitable standard to serve as vehicular and pedestrian access to the site and offered for adoption. The site continues past Silverdale Mount so it would leave some residents at the end on a short stretch of unadopted road, unless this section is in fact adopted now. Why is the council changing its mind from older persons housing to a school when Guiseley school has very recently completed an extension presumably because a need had been identified.

3.4 A change I consider to be necessary to make the plan sound would be to make it meet the existing NPPF. Also, I consider that consultation with Bradford Council about their housing plans is needed.

Part 4

4.1 I do not consider the plan to be legally compliant.

4.2 My comments are about the Duty to Cooperate and Community Involvement.

4.3 The council held an open session in a chapel to let local people know about the plans which was overwhelmed by the number of visitors. That should itself say something about strength of feeling in Aireborough. Since then the involvement locally has been led by the Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum by their members being present in the local supermarket and freely engaging with people. I have access to email so receive communications from citizens at Leeds council so have seen the reminders about the deadline for responses. The council acknowledges that some groups of society are under represented on line, such as the elderly so many residents can be unaware of the response timetable or even the actual Site Allocation Plan.

In the council's Statement of Community Involvement it says that all documents will be set out clearly and written using straight

forward language without jargon. I feel the response form is daunting, complicated and designed to make people not use it. The separate guidance says it is possible to write a letter of objection instead of using the form but it doesn't say the same on the response form, steering people towards electronic communication. I don't know if a letter would be "counted" if the specific "legal" questions were not answered. My elderly neighbours have looked at a Response Form and decided not to bother filling one in because it uses too many legal sounding terms.

Again in the Statement of Community Involvement document it acknowledges there may be relatively low uptake of online services. Access to the internet is not available to everyone due to a variety of reasons and some Aireborough residents may have missed out on the consultation process totally particularly if they are isolated in the community.

Part 5

5.1 Yes

Part 6

I would like to be notified of the Submission of the Plan for Public Examination

Submitted by
Christine Pearce
on 15 November 2015