

From: [Becky Prosser](#)
To: [Site Allocations Plan](#)
Subject: PDE02654_Leeds housing site allocation consultation - response
Date: 16 November 2015 16:17:29

Dear Madam,

I wish to comment upon the site allocation 3026 Birks Farm (Ings Lane) Guiseley and also make other more general comments in relation to Aireborough's housing targets.

1) Site 3026 is Greenbelt land. It fulfils an important role in safeguarding countryside from encroachment and provides a green and breathing 'belt' between the distinct and different settlements of Guiseley and Menston. Building on this site is NOT infill. It would be urban sprawl. It would be allowing the settlement of Guiseley to merge with the different and separate settlement of Menston. Historically this has already happened with Rawdon, Yeadon and Guiseley and should not be allowed to happen to Guiseley and Menston.

The land is fulfilling it's role as Greenbelt.

With regards to the local ecology and environment. Mire Beck regularly overflows its banks. The land is low lying and therefore future housing built on here may be subject to flooding. With a changing and more unpredictable climate it would not seem sensible to build on here and provide less space for 'run off' at times of high rain fall and flooding.

The site is subject to a number of trees that have tree preservation orders. There are worn footpaths along the land which are well used. I know, because I use them. At a time when we are increasingly concerned with public health in terms of obesity and air quality having an impact upon health and wellbeing, it does not seem sound or fair to prepare a housing plan which encourages building on significant amounts of green belt land. The council may feel that there is limited impact on removing this green belt land in Aireborough, but the people of Aireborough feel differently. How are we providing a 'Best City' for the residents (young and old) who live here if we remove more and more green space? Aireborough has been proportionally over developed in recent years and further housing will not help contribute towards 'Best City'. It will remove the special characteristics from a special and wonderful 'locality'.

It would appear that the housing plan is not sound and has not been prepared fairly because I can find little or no reference to the impact upon existing infrastructure and facilities. Local schools are already expanding to meet the current over capacity created by a rising birth rate and recent housing developments. Additionally health care facilities are also over stretched. Again, it is not clear to me how placing further pressure on such facilities is contributing towards 'Best City'. Guiseley is well served by a train station, but trains are over crowded at peak times and over 1000 more homes will only add to this. It is well acknowledged that the A65 is congested at peak times and beyond (traffic through Guiseley is regularly at a standstill during non peak times). Development at

Guiseley, Yeadon, Rawdon & Horsforth will further exacerbate this as will further developments at Menston. The housing plan drawn up does not seem sound because it appears that Leeds and Bradford have not liaised well in terms of developments close to the boundaries.

With specific regards to Highway Infrastructure and site 3026, Ings Lane has a sweeping S bend. Many of the properties along it have no off road parking which means that at points the carriage way is single track. Building a further 300 houses which egress onto this road will no doubt cause congestion and safety issues. Further the junction at Netherfield road end is difficult to negotiate because of limited visibility of traffic coming from the direction of Otley (there is a brow of a hill). More traffic using this junction would be likely to cause safety issues and queueing. The junction with Ings lane and the A65 already causes congestion at peak times as traffic from the 'minor' Ings Lane queues to join the A65. This problem would be exacerbated by increasing housing stock along this lane and in conjunction with the parked cars (from houses with no off road parking) is likely to become log jammed at peak times.

Whilst it is acknowledged that Leeds as a district needs further housing, it is not clear that building in an already over developed area of the city without sufficient infrastructure provides evidence of a sound or fair housing plan that has taken into consideration the needs of the local residents. If this authority truly wants to create the 'Best City', then a more innovative approach to meeting housing targets is required. Simply building on green field sites and allowing urban sprawl without further investment in infrastructure and facilities will not do.

Kind regards
Mrs Rebecca James
3 Nethercliffe Road
Guiseley
Leeds