

From:
To: [Site Allocations Plan](#)
Subject: PDE02010_Leeds UDP Ref Aireborough and site HG2 -10 Gill Lane Yeadon
Date: 12 November 2015 11:29:21

I wish to express my concerns about the development plan for Aireborough with specific reference to site HG2-10(previously 1221) Gill Lane Yeadon.

I gather that according to National Policy plans must be seen to be sustainable I question the sustainability of building a further 2,200 homes in this area given that

2,400 homes have already been built in this area in the last ten years.

I will not consider all the areas of concern which I am sure others will have put forward, just the areas I have direct experience of.

1. Schools.

A friend's children are already having to be taught in portakabins brought in to use as classrooms because the school did not have capacity for the numbers already, due to the rapid expansion of the area. If further development goes ahead where will the increased number of children go to school? There appear to be no further plans for building new schools in the area.

2 Transport

The A65 already moves only nose to tail at many times of the day and even at weekends with people trying to reach the Dales or more locally the shopping areas in Guiseley. I gather the would be developer for the site in question did their traffic survey at half term!!

Even more worrying is the gridlock at JCT roundabout where people taking a short cut from the Harrogate Road(A658))to avoid the tail back at Rawdon traffic lights, come down Green Lane crossing the A65. at the roundabout and going on into Apperley Lane. There is already a serious tailback up the A65 and also traffic backing up Green Lane because Apperley Lane is full of traffic waiting to go through the traffic lights at the other end, to rejoin the A658 down to Apperley Bridge and Bradford. The congestion at both crossing points(A658/A65) a very serious problem with no solutions being put forward in the plan.

I have heard it said that improvements taking place at Horsforth roundabout are designed to ease the problem. This roundabout is about three miles away and will have no impact on the increasing problem at J.C.T roundabout. This is a very serious problem already which I have experienced even at 3.15. on a non-school day. There are plans already for a further number of houses to be built on the old mill site in Green Lane, a further large housing development is under construction at Apperley Bridge which falls under Bradford Council and Apperley Bridge Station is also due to open soon. My concern is that even without any further developments proposed in the area the traffic will grind to a halt. THIS IS SERIOUS definitely affecting sustainability.

National Planning Policy says that plans should conserve and enhance the natural and historic environment.

SITE HG2-10(previously 1221)Gill Lane

This site is an area of historic pastureland being grazed at present by a local

farmers cows. It is an area with many mature trees and wildlife and is adjacent to a historic Conservation Area with listed buildings. If developed it would fully urbanise what was once a historic rural heartland.

The Proposed exit from this site for 155 houses is onto the A 65 so please see above re issue of TRANSPORT sustainability.

National Planning Policy aims at protecting Green Belt Land. This site is in The Green Belt so in order for this site to be developed this land would have to be withdrawn from the green belt. The argument put forward for this piece of land being withdrawn is that it does not really fulfil Green Belt criteria rather being infill.

Looking at Green Belt Criteria I would argue this site fulfils the following criteria.

1. Safeguards countryside from encroachment.

2. Checks unrestricted sprawl being one of the last pieces of pastureland and open space along the A65 out of Leeds to as far as Menston

3 Prevent neighbouring towns merging. This site is on the border of Leeds and Bradford. Looking at the site from where the Westfield Estate joins the A65 you can see that it is part of a swathe of green belt land which separates the boundaries of the two cities.

4 Preserve the setting and special character of historic areas. This site is historic pastureland and is adjacent to a Conservation area and listed buildings.

In 1995 at appeal by the then would be developers, the Inspector found in favour of Leeds City Council position at the time that this was relevant Green Belt. In addition the boundaries of the site being considered for withdrawal are rather arbitrary with it including a small strip of land not wide enough and with insufficient vision for an entrance, coming down through the Conservation Area to Gill Lane.

My neighbours and I have fought for years to keep this land Green Belt and though I realise that the Government has declared that some Green Belt must go, for the reasons given above feel it would be regretful and inappropriate for this site to be one of them. If however this was to be withdrawn from Green Belt then I feel a more definitive Green Belt boundary would be more appropriate either withdrawing the small strip or taking the new boundary to Gill Lane.

It is stated that Cities should cooperate with each other re planning. I wonder how much consultation there has been between Leeds and Bradford regarding these matters? Given that the developments and the area under consideration are on the borders of these two large cities I would think this was of paramount importance especially given the importance of transport sustainability and prevention of urban sprawl for both City Councils.

Accepting that more housing is required, instead of overloading this sensitive boundary area with, in my opinion, unsustainable development, it would I feel be more favourable to look at more inner city urban sites which would positively regenerate the areas concerned rather than overload to standing point and change the nature of the area being discussed.

I hope the Inspector will give due consideration to my views and would be

interested in being informed of the outcome of the deliberations.

Yours sincerely,
Mrs G. Carlile