

From:
To: [Site Allocations Plan](#)
Subject: PDE01574_Aireborough Site Allocation Plans - Objections
Date: 14 November 2015 18:16:30

LDF Publication Draft Consultation
Forward Planning & Implementation
The Leonardo Building
2 Rossington Street
Leeds, LS2 8HD

3, Shaw Lane Gardens
Guiseley
Leeds LS20 9JQ

Saturday 14th November 2015

Dear Sir or Madam,

I wish to comment on the soundness of the Aireborough Site Allocation Plans as part of the consultation process before the plans are reviewed by a Planning Inspector.

I live on Shaw Lane Gardens, which forms the Southern boundary of site number 3029 (HG2-2). The Banksfield/Coppice Wood site (1255B) is adjacent. With the proposed construction of 133 homes on the Wills Gill site and 234 on the Banksfield site, a major urban extension would be created, which would join together the settlements of Guiseley and Yeadon.

I will be commenting on the following themes, to demonstrate that the plan is not sound: loss of greenbelt, local services, schools, conservation, and ecology.

I do not consider the plan with respect to site 3029 (HG2-2) to be sound for the following reasons.

--[if !supportLists]-->1. <!--[endif]-->**Justified:** for the plan to be 'justified', it must be clearly founded on valid research. However, the information contained in the Sustainability Appraisal and Greenbelt Review is inaccurate in parts.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->The Greenbelt Review considers the site to be well connected to a built up area, with 2 or more boundaries. This is manifestly not the case, as one of the boundaries is Wills Gill lane, an unlit track with just 7 homes.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->The Greenbelt Review considers that development would not lead to a physical connection of 2 or more settlements. If the Wills Gill and Banksfield site were developed, with the creation of 367 houses, Guiseley and Yeadon would merge. The last remaining rural land between Guiseley and Yeadon, offering a characteristic view and retaining the 'village' character of Guiseley, would disappear.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->The Greenbelt Review ignores the 70 mature trees on the site, which are an important part its biodiversity, as well as creating an iconic view (the row of poplars along Wills Gill). Site 1256, which is adjacent to the Wills Gill site, is considered 'very diverse', yet site 3029 contains the same varied mix of species and is also a damp meadow environment. There is no justification for giving it a different classification.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->The Sustainability Review ignores the two agricultural buildings on the site. Sheep and cattle graze the land on site 3029, and these building are used for the livestock in winter. Site 3029 is surrounded by greenbelt and the fields all the way up to Otley Chevin Forest Park are in agricultural use. Walkers and horse riders use the network of parks for recreation and appreciate the fact that this land is still farmed.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->The Sustainability Review states that the site is not adjacent to a conservation area or listed buildings, but it is. The Western boundary of site 3029 is adjacent to Guiseley's conservation area and the medieval Crofts and Tofts, long strips of land which are rare and of significant value. The Crofts and Tofts provide a transition between the village and the rural aspect of the greenbelt off the Queensway. If site 3029 were built on, the character of this part of Guiseley, and the long distance views, would be destroyed.

--[if !supportLists]-->2. <!--[endif]-->**Is the plan 'positively prepared'? Does it meet the community's needs for, inter alia, community facilities, education, shops, sport, leisure and infrastructure?** As a resident of Guiseley, who uses all the local facilities and lives adjacent to site 3029, I am convinced that this development does not take into account existing pressures on local services, let alone future needs.

<!--[if !supportLists]-->• <!--[endif]-->**Education:** I have two young

children in school in Guiseley - I had considerable problems finding school places for the two of them and initially one of them was offered a place in a school the other side of Leeds. If this is the situation now, how will the educational infrastructure cope with an increase in the population of school aged children.

• **Traffic:** the A65 is already very congested. I am in the fortunate position of being able to commute by bicycle most of the time, but even on a bike my journeys are delayed by traffic. I see no enhanced provision for public transport, cycling, parking at Guiseley station or any other prospect of dealing with existing congestion, let alone increased traffic.

• **Healthcare:** It is nearly impossible to find a dentist in Guiseley, and the waiting time to get through to a doctors surgery locally do book an appointment can be long. Again the existing services are already struggling to cope.

3. **Is the plan consistent with national policy?** The Office of National Statistics projects a housing need of 45,000 households for the whole of Leeds, not 74,000, but Leeds City Council has refused to modify its assessment.

In summary, the Wills Gill site (3029) contributes to the distinctive appearance of the edge of Guiseley. Housing development on this site would encroach on greenbelt land and contribute to urban sprawl by connecting two settlements. It would also unacceptably increase the pressure on local services such as schools and GPs, which are already struggling to cope with existing needs, as well as increasing traffic in an already congested area.

This land was still classified as 'unsuitable for housing' in 2013. Based on criteria such as avoiding building on greenbelt land except under exceptional circumstances, safeguarding Guiseley's character and heritage, and creating a plan that meets the needs of the local community in consultation with local people, I do not believe the plan is sound.

I understand that 95% of the sites to be found for housing in Aireborough are on greenbelt land, whereas the original target was 52%. What is the explanation for the change? Greenbelt exists to protect the countryside and agricultural land and it should not be sacrificed to development. On a more philosophical note - what is the Council doing to try to limit population growth? An expanding population is not sustainable. The ecological footprint of the UK with the existing population lifestyle already exceeds the UK's capacity. We need to safeguard valuable countryside and agricultural land and recognise the valuable environmental services it provides.

Yours faithfully,

Alan Weekes