

From:
To: [Site Allocations Plan](#)
Subject: PDE01517_Objection to proposed planning Aireborough- Gill Lane/A65 HG2-10/HG1-1D (1221), Coach Road HG2-5 (1180A, 1311A, 2163A), Shaw Lane/Banksfield HG2-3 (1255B) and Wills Gill HG2-2 (3029)
Date: 15 November 2015 10:08:22

Dear Sirs

RE : Objection to proposed planning Aireborough - Gill Lane/A65 HG2-10/HG1-1D (1221), Coach Road HG2-5 (1180A, 1311A, 2163A), Shaw Lane/Banksfield HG2-3 (1255B) and Wills Gill HG2-2 (3029)

Mrs Kirsty Tounsend, 34 Redwood Way, Yeadon, Leeds, LS19 7JU – Concerned resident

I do not think the proposed plans are effective as there are so many sites, in addition to those quoted above, in consideration for development which although located very near to each other belong to different councils. There does not appear to have been a close working relationship between the adjoining Councils on any cross-boundary strategies. If agreed the sites through from Horsforth, Rawdon, Yeadon, Guiseley, Hollings Hall and Apperley Bridge would all have a huge negative impact on the local infrastructure and roads and it does not appear that this has been taken into consideration by Leeds and Bradford City Councils.

I am not satisfied that enough public consultation was provided to make residents in effected areas aware. Had it not been for the efforts of the Aireborough Neighbourhood Development Forum and Aireborough Voice members, myself and my neighbours would not have known anything about the proposals in the first place.

I have lived in Aireborough for over 40 years. In that time I have seen all the local mills close down along with one of the secondary schools (Aireborough Grammar) and be replaced with housing, the majority family homes and retail parks. This in itself has led to a huge increase in traffic, with the A65 being congested the majority of the time. The small estate where I live sits just off the A65 and Kirk Lane and already we struggle to get in and out of our street, particularly at rush hour and weekends due to the sheer number of vehicles on the road.

Should any or all of the proposed sites be built on, this issue can only get worse as the majority of homes will lead to an extra one or two cars travelling in the area. In addition to this, permission has been granted for yet another supermarket, Aldi, on Kirk Lane and we are to expect increased traffic from people out of the area travelling just to shop (by passing a number of other supermarkets along the way). My children currently attend Yeadon Westfield Junior School but my eldest is due to start secondary school, hopefully at Guiseley High School, next year. I am already worried about her safety walking to and from school due to the amount of traffic and major roads she has to negotiate and cannot see how further residential development in the area can make this situation

anything other than a parent's worst nightmare.

There does not appear to be any infrastructure changes planned before any go ahead on the development plans is given. Each new residential property will bring extra people into the Aireborough district but there are no new doctor or dental surgeries or new schools planned to accommodate this. Where will all the new residents work as there are no new businesses/employers being encouraged? I myself work in Stourton and the journey to work during rush hour can take over an hour each way, whether using the A65 or surrounding roads. Surely this can only get worse if new residents will also have to travel out of the area to their places of employment as there are limited opportunities in the local vicinity. Where will the children go to school when the current educational facilities are full? Will we be looking at further planning requests on yet more Green Belt land to cover this issue as an afterthought in the future?

Should the plans be granted, the proposed sites would result in urban sprawl and would destroy the communities and further erode the distinctive borders between the three individual towns within Aireborough both of which I am keen to sustain. Aireborough has been described as a major urban settlement but unlike other similar sized settlements, we have very little in the way of entertainment or leisure facilities for its residents. Other than the swimming pool/leisure centre in Guiseley (which has changed very little since it was built nearly 50 years ago) we have nothing such as a bowling alley or cinema and nowhere for the youth to socialize in safety. This I feel is an issue that has been overlooked and would result again, in even more building consents being given in the future.

On the figures I have been provided, nearly 1000 properties have already been built or given planning consent since 2012 in Aireborough. To meet the Leeds Local Development plan target for our community of 2300 homes a total of 93% of these will have to be built on Green Belt land. Has a full Green Belt review been completed? Are there no other brownfield sites across Leeds that could be utilised? If there are absolutely no other alternatives, would it not be prudent to use smaller percentages of Green Belt land across numerous sites to limit the impact on single communities?

Anyone who has viewed the proposed sites can see their natural beauty and that of the surrounding areas. They provide places for outdoor pursuits, family walks, access to nature and fresh air. This is one of the reasons the people within Aireborough choose to pay more for their family homes here than the equivalent in other settlements within the area. The position of the existing housing developments provides easy access to these beautiful areas which can and are utilised all year round. If the proposed building goes ahead, this will drastically alter the scenery and we will lose the rural element and charm of the area which we are all desperate to retain.

In summary:-

- I do not feel residents have been given adequate information and minimal public

consultation from Leeds City Council.

- There seems to have been little consideration given to the close proximity of all the proposed sites and the impact this will have, particularly congestion on the A65 and surrounding roads.
- There is no forward plan for infrastructure in place (roads, doctors, schools and leisure facilities).
- Brownfield sites appear to have been identified and overlooked in favour of developers wishes.
- Over 90% of the proposed building will be on Green Belt land, which CANNOT be in the interests of existing residents, wildlife and future generations.

Regards

Mrs Kirsty Tounsend