

From: [Site Allocations Plan](#)
To: [Site Allocations Plan](#)
Subject: PDE02264_FW: Wills Gill 3029 (HG2-2) (Site Allocation Consultation)
Date: 08 December 2015 14:47:10

-----Original Message-----

From: Hayley Mason
Sent: 09 November 2015 12:06
To: Site Allocations Plan
Subject: Wills Gill 3029 (HG2 - 2) (Site Allocation Consultation)

Hello

Just to follow on from my previous email, my full address is 46 Ashtofts Mount, Guiseley, Leeds, LS20 9DB.

Thank you

Hayley Mason

From: Hayley Mason
Sent: 09 November 2015 11:58
To: Site Allocations Plan
Subject: Wills Gill 3029 (HG2-2) (Site Allocation Consultation)

Hello

I am writing in response to the Site Allocation Consultation for Wills Gill 3029 (HG2-2).

I want to outline the concerns I have for this specific site allocation and how the plan does not meet the tests of soundness.

I live close by to the site on Ashtofts Mount in Guiseley and believe the allocation does not meet these tests of soundness on two accounts:

- 1) Positively Prepared
- 2) Justified

This site was included in the council's list of proposed sites based on a greenbelt assessment and a site survey. Several key facts were incorrect in the survey.

In the council's survey:

1 It took no account of the medieval Tofts and Crofts bordering the site; their section on historic environment was blank. This is the most ancient part of Guiseley with 6 Grade II listed buildings on adjacent Town Street and the site borders Guiseley Conservation Area.

2) Took no account of traffic issues. The latest site allocation document says, "There is a cumulative impact of development on the A65 corridor. The development will be required to contribute to measures to mitigate the cumulative impact of this and other allocated sites affecting the corridor. These measure may take the form of contributions

towards more significant measures such as improvements to Horsforth roundabout.”

The latest site allocation document says that a road will be made to link the Wills Gill site with the Banksfield Mount 1255B site to the East to “improve access for both sites”. As one of the major issues with the Banksfield Mount site is poor access, this seems like a poor solution and can only be a way of getting the site to be agreed by creating a potential rat run between the two.

The roads around Guiseley are already gridlock, the infrastructure is clearly unable to cope with the amount of transport which passes through the area. Increasing numbers of cars would only add to this problem further, as well as increasing air pollution which does not seem to have been taken into account at all.

As a regular train commuter, the trains are already at capacity making journeys into Leeds on a morning both unpleasant and dangerous with the amount of people trying to get onto the trains. Again, this development will only add to this problem.

3) Took no account of the “biodiversity” of the site, scoring it with a 0. However, site 1256 on the other side of Wills Gill Lane was considered biodiverse and scored as -2 (very diverse). It is the same type of land, wet grassland with becks and the same species of wildlife visiting it.

Greenbelt Assessment:

4) They say the site is NOT adjacent to a conservation area, listed building or other - however it IS adjacent to the Guiseley Conservation Area.

5) They say the site has 2 or more boundaries with the existing built up area. This is not true. Seven houses on the unadopted, unlit track of Wills Gill cannot be deemed as a “built up area”.

6) It stipulates that the development of the site would NOT lead to physical connection of two or more settlements - however this is the last field preventing Guiseley and Yeadon completely merging along Queensway.

7) They say the site does not include significant unprotected (by law) tree/hedge cover - yet it has approximately 70 mature native trees, including oak, ash, beech, copper beech, whitebeam, horse chestnut, willow and poplar.

As the latest site allocation document now says, “The site is in the setting of Guiseley Conservation Area. Any development should preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. A significant buffer is required to the western part of the site to protect the character of the adjacent surviving medieval field system,” - it should never have been included in the list of suitable houses at all, particularly as so many key facts are incorrect.

Why has it changed from “unsuitable for housing” in 2014 to “suitable” in early 2015? This is a significant housing development, a direct comparison can be made between the Cromptons site on Netherfield Road. This has fewer houses planned (116 in total), 133 are planned for this site.

Yours sincerely,

Hayley Mason