

From: [Michael Blakey](#)
To: [Site Allocations Plan](#)
Subject: PDE02791_Leeds site allocations 4043 (HG3-1) PAS land and 3026 Ings Lane and 1221 (HG2-10) Gill Lane
- NOT Sound
Date: 16 November 2015 15:30:52

Mr Michael Blakey
49 Ings Lane
Guiseley
LS20 9HR

I wish to make comment on the Leeds Site Allocations Plan regarding the above 3 proposed building sites and would like this email to be counted individually for the 3 sites I have mentioned above.

These 3 greenbelt sites would clearly merge settlements and reduce further the bit of Green belt and long distance views Guiseley has left.

The Ings Lane settlements would merge with Menston and Gill Lane would merge with Henshaw. these can be seen clearly on a map.

The 4043 Ings Lane site is a natural 'Ing' and Curlew and Lapwings breed here and owls and bats feed from the site. It is a special landscape area. Both Ings Lane sites are used for agriculture. Site 4043 shares a border within a conservation area ie The Ings Public House.

Ings Lane is a narrow country road and as a previous email from Kenny Harkis at Leeds Highways informed me and I quote 'not a suitable road to carry large amount of traffic'.

Every time traffic has been diverted up Ings Lane, whilst we have lived here there has been an accident.

Traffic now on the A65 is gridlocked during rush hour and a constant stream at any other time. The air pollution must be abysmal.

There has been no consultation with the Residents and no dialogue with neighbouring Bradford Council.

The plan is not sound, it has been prepared on flawed data, is it not justified as no guidance was taken from the people who live in the area and it fails on consistency with National Policy as the Greenbelt does not need to be built on as Leeds has numerous brownfield sites and greenfield sites that would cause less harm.

Yours faithfully

Michael Blakey