

From:
To: [Site Allocations Plan](#)
Cc:
Subject: PDE01960_Aireborough HMCA
Date: 12 November 2015 17:23:40

Submission of Comment by Councillor Graham Latty, Guiseley & Rawdon Ward.

In respect of **Aireborough Housing Market Characteristic Area**

I am setting out here my concerns on the Allocation of Sites in the Aireborough HMCA.

I believe the Leeds Site Allocations Plan to be unsound on the grounds that it is not **Positively Prepared, Justified** or **Consistent** with **National Policy**.

It is not **Positively prepared** in that it does not seek to explain how it meets the development needs of the area, only considering the need to share out the total commitment to housing development in Leeds and completely ignoring the infrastructure requirements of Aireborough now, let alone were such development to take place.

It is not **Justified** in that whilst there is a justifiable need for more housing the plan ignores the fact that Aireborough has already provided more new housing than its infrastructure can realistically support.

It is not **Consistent** with **National Policy** in that it would require the loss of a high proportion of our green belt, without the benefit of a comprehensive green belt review and would result in the merging of individual townships.

These points apply to most of the sites on which I will comment individually.

Further to this there is no provision in the plan for improvement of the **infrastructure**. There is no plan to improve **road connections**, there is no provision within Aireborough for more **employment** other than at the airport which is not in Aireborough and which is not a natural direction for local people to take. This lack of employment opportunities coupled with the expansion of such (employment) provision in other areas of Leeds will only serve to increase traffic on the A65 as new residents travel to work. Pollution levels will rise proportionately and detrimentally.

The current lack of **primary school places** means that with planned current school extensions there will be places for the children we have now but none for the expansion that would naturally follow from implementation of this plan. The suggestion that a primary school might be accommodated on the Coach Road site is derisory. It is in totally the wrong place and without a programme of compulsory purchase to create road access would exacerbate the complete chaos which affects Silverdale Avenue at morning and afternoon rush hours.

HG2-6 (1113) Land at Silverdale Avenue (Allotments)

This site whilst being an infill site would throw an even heavier burden on the only access/egress to the Silverdale estate. That is the narrow Silverdale Avenue which is currently heavily parked and at times it is inaccessible to ambulances and fire engines.

It exits on to Park Road which is one of the busiest roads in Guiseley and a road used by children and young people on their way to and from school.

This site should be considered in conjunction with :

HG2-5 (1180A - 1311A & 2163A. Coach Road.

This is a green belt site, extremely attractive and in agricultural use.

Coach Road has only one direct access via Silverdale Avenue which as I have said is already a difficult access and with this site and the one at Silverdale Avenue (above) would put the traffic from a total of 112 extra homes on to this narrow crowded estate road and on to the aforementioned Park Road.

One of these sites making up Coach Road is suggested as a suitable site for a primary school, a site just about as far from the rest of Guiseley as you can get and a site that would again have to use Silverdale Avenue for access/egress. My introductory remarks refer.

The only alternative exit is via an unmade, unadopted private section of Coach Road which would have to be compulsorily purchased, and the residents who own it have not previously been amenable to adoption. The available width is acknowledged to be below the minimum requirement for a public road adoptable road.

Finally, these sites back on to the Bradford boundary and if they chose to build then the two cities would be very close to being joined.

HG2-1 (3026) New Birks Farm, Ings Lane

This site as its name implies is wetland, it is a site that attracts a host of wildlife, particularly birds which would be a huge loss to the local scene.

It is also land that if developed would merge Guiseley with Menston effectively joining Leeds to Bradford postal districts.

The only possible access/egress would be from and on to Ings Lane and thence on to the A65, arguably the most congested road in Leeds.

Because of its low-lying position it would destroy the long distance views from the adjacent Chevin with detrimental impact on the green belt.

HG2-4 (4020) Hollins Hill and Hawkstone Avenue,

This is a green belt site currently in agricultural use. It is on the crest of Hollins Hill so extremely visible. Rather than filling in any gap it would actually move the city boundary outwards. Access would be problematic as the nearest road is Hollins Hill which is a busy commuter road that runs between Bradford and Guiseley so any estate access would be hazardous.

HG2-2 (3029) Wills Gill

This is a green belt site which is an important part of the green corridor between and separating Guiseley and Yeadon. It is adjacent to some medieval fields and any development would completely detract from their setting between green belt and the old conservation area dwellings.

Access would be from Queensway, already a major route between Yeadon and Guiseley with little capacity for a big expansion in traffic density.

Together with the site in HG2-2 this would result in merging of Yeadon and Guiseley

HG2-3 (1255B) Shaw Lane(land at) Guiseley and Banksfield Mount, Yeadon.

This site completes the green corridor referred to in the comments on Wills Gill, and the same comments apply here. (Apart from the medieval strips).

HG2-10 (1221) Gill Lane, Yeadon.

This site would fill in the last green break in the urban sprawl between Rawdon, Yeadon and Guiseley. It closely abuts the Nether Yeadon conservation area, one of our most important relics of the early and continued growth of industry in the shallow valley that runs down towards Esholt. Development would detrimentally affect the setting of that important area and would certainly result in increased vehicle traffic. It is suggested that it is capable of taking 155 homes and the resultant traffic exiting onto the A65 (via Gill Lane) would bring more problems to an already congested section of that road.

Those are my comments in support of my submission that the Leeds Site Allocation Plan
Is unsound.

Cllr Graham Latty
Guiseley and Rawdon Ward
Conservative Chief Whip
Shadow Executive Member Adult Social Care

Visit my website at: <https://grahamlatty.wordpress.com>

Cllr Graham Latty
Conservative Chief Whip
Shadow Executive Member Adult Social Care

Visit my website at: <https://grahamlatty.wordpress.com>

Cllr Graham Latty
Conservative Chief Whip
Shadow Executive Member Adult Social Care

Visit my website at: <https://grahamlatty.wordpress.com>