

From:
To: [Site Allocations Plan](#)
Subject: PDE01801_Leeds City Council Site Allocation Consultation - Aireborough - HG2-5
Date: 13 November 2015 14:29:59

Site Reference HG2-5 Coach Road/Park Road, Guiseley

Comments and Objections from Allan Millington, 13 Silverdale Road, Guiseley, LS20 8AZ

I wish to challenge the soundness of the proposals to build on this site, my comments being as follows:

The Purposes of Greenbelt

1. To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.
2. To prevent neighbouring towns from merging
3. To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
4. To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns

Leeds City Council's rationale for including this site in it's plan is that it contributes towards meeting it's share of housing targets. It is my understanding that in meeting these targets the development of greenbelt sites is not allowed.

The Council's SHLAA, ref. 1180A_1311A_2163A, includes the following assessments/comments:

High potential to lead to unrestricted sprawl. 98.69% of site is greenbelt. Site performs an important role in safeguarding from encroachment. Overlaps Conservation Area. Overlaps Public Right of Way. Overlaps potential contamination.

Clearly these remarks demonstrate that the site proposals are in breach of the defined purposes of greenbelt, and therefore are not sound. The site should be retained as agricultural land providing a contribution to the local economy and access for the community to the benefits of the open countryside.

Infrastructure Issues

Traffic access to the site is a major issue. One family home produces 6 traffic movements per day in an area where commuting is high (source CPRE) - this is a very considerable increase in overall traffic if 83 new homes are built. The only practical route to the site from Guiseley is via Silverdale Avenue which is narrow with on-street parking on the approaches to Park Road. Congestion, in particular at peak times, is already a problem and such an increase is not sustainable. The only alternative approach to the site is along a section of Coach Road which is privately owned, not a made up road, full of large

potholes, very muddy in wet conditions, and has no pedestrian footpaths - clearly not suitable for traffic access to the site without additional development, but as already stated the road is privately owned. I also have concerns as a resident on Silverdale Road that, should Coach Road be developed, traffic would use Silverdale Road as an alternative route between Coach Road and Silverdale Avenue.

The only major road through Guiseley giving access to the city of Leeds is the A65. Traffic is already extremely heavy on this road, with major congestion at peak times. This affects not just Guiseley but all of the towns along the A65 corridor. There is also a need to develop public transport provision to the area - in relation to both access to Leeds and to this particular site. A regular bus service into the Silverdale estate would only further add to the complications of traffic congestion.

The site plan retains provision for a school, but does not state whether this would be for primary or secondary education. Whichever, this would add to the traffic problems on Silverdale Avenue as the catchment area for the school would extend beyond the Silverdale area. The development of 83 homes would mean a significant increase in the number of pupils needing access to schools, and unless the proposal to build on this site provides for both primary and secondary education there would be an impact on capacity at existing schools outside of the Silverdale area.

I have not seen any assessments relating to the effect of the site on the wildlife in the surrounding countryside. This is a factor which should be taken into account in the proposals.

Once again referring to the Council's SHLAA, ref. 1180A_1311A_2163A, the following assessments/comments are included:

The site is outside bus and rail requirements. Silverdale estate not suitable for large increase in traffic. Traffic calming in Silverdale estate would be required.

These comments again call into question the soundness of this proposal.

Conclusions

For the reasons outlined above I contend that the inclusion of this site in the allocation plans is unsound and should be rejected