

**From:**  
**To:** [Site Allocations Plan](#)  
**Subject:** PDE02874\_Leeds Site Allocation Plan Consultation  
**Date:** 16 November 2015 14:52:45

---

I believe this Plan is unsound and does not comply legally.

#### SOUNDNESS

- Not positively prepared as there has not been a comprehensive review of the local needs, eg housing – targets are based on old statistics which far exceed genuine need, employment, education, medical services, facilities for sport and leisure.
- Not justified as it is not consistent with National Policy as it relies very heavily in Green Belt land instead of alternative sites. Have ALL the brownfield sites in Leeds been used or earmarked for development before GB land is proposed? S.79 & 80 of the NPPF indicate the Government attaches great importance to GB:- to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; to safeguard the countryside from encroachment ( and the resultant harm to wild life, country walks, etc); to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns and conservation areas; to help in urban regeneration. S.87 states inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the GB and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. In the case of Guiseley where I live, I do not believe "very special circumstances" exist. Developments on the proposed sites for Guiseley would not enhance and protect the valued landscapes and they would lead to the merging of separate communities.

#### LEGALITY

The SAP does not appear to comply with legal requirements.

- There is a 'duty to cooperate' but I understand there has not been full liaison over planning between the Leeds and Bradford City Councils despite the fact that developments in one can have an effect on the other, eg with traffic issues, education, etc. Nor has there been full liaison with various local bodies such as the Aireborough Neighbourhood Forum (ANF).
- Prior to the drawing up of this Plan there has been little real and helpful community involvement. The exhibitions put on by the Council were not very user friendly to the general public. In the Guiseley one it was very hard to find clear information about the sites in the area amongst all the myriad of posters and booklets and the scale of the maps was too small. The ANF 'pop-in' in Guiseley on 11th November was much more helpful.

#### GUISELEY

This area has already borne the brunt of a considerable amount of building over the last few years, eg sites at High Royds, Silver Cross, Springfield Mills, Netherfield Road, Queensway, The Laureates. I understand that some of the authorised building has not yet been completed as the developers are waiting for prospective buyers. The majority of the housing is the higher end of the market with 4 or more bedrooms. It has not met the needs of first-time buyers or those wishing to downsize and be nearer the town centre.

The SAP does not take into account the infrastructure which is already creaking without any further development. There are the following issues:-

#### Traffic:

- There has been a considerable increase in the volume of traffic in this area particularly along the A65, A6038 and Park Road which links the two. The extensive building in recent years not only in Guiseley but also in other areas along the A65 corridor has contributed to this. Has a by-pass been considered – underground if need be? Pedestrian crossing at the upper end of Park Road from Park Lane downwards is hazardous because of the constant two-way traffic and the footpath on the right-hand side part way down is almost non-existent. Can a second crossing be provided?
- More traffic means more air pollution which is a hazard for people like myself who have breathing problems.

#### Parking

- Less local employment with the closure of most of the factories in Guiseley means more commuters. This means not only more traffic but also more parking problems as people going into the city centres by public transport want to park cars in the centre of Guiseley for the day. Can the current car park on Netherfield Road be extended into a multi-storey car park going underground instead of / as well as building upwards?

#### Health services

- Now having to wait longer to get appointments with the doctor. More development would exacerbate this further.

#### Education

- Some more primary school accommodation has recently been provided but this will lead to more secondary school places being needed as they get older. This is without any further housing in the area. Has any provision been made for further secondary school accommodation?

Leisure facilities

- To cater for existing needs alone the current leisure centre at the Green needs updating.
- More housing would create a need for more recreational ground and play areas. This would be better on GB land than housing.

No evaluation has been made of the contribution the specified GB sites make to the Guiseley Conservation Area nor of the impact the loss of these sites would have on the GCA or the flora and fauna.

Sites 3026 (HG2-1) & 3029 (HG2-2)

- Development would mean the loss of valuable agricultural land (Grade 3), affect the well-trodden country footpaths through the area and ruin this area of natural beauty.
- This area includes trees with Preservation Orders and well established hedgerows.
- Development would be detrimental to the wildlife there.
- The fields are flooded regularly as Mire Beck overflows.
- Due to the poor state of the sewage system Mire Beck has also been subject to sewage pollution.
- It provides a buffer between Guiseley and Menston thus conserving their separate identities – one of the purposes of GB. Development would be contrary to this and lead to the merger of the two.
- These sites are either in or on the edge of the GCA. Development would detract from that rather than enhance it.

Site 1255B (HG2-3)

- Development of this site would destroy the beauty of the open landscape which is enjoyed not just by residents but also by visitors who come to the area to walk along the country footpaths/bridle ways.
- Access would be difficult and add to the existing traffic problems on Queensway.
- It provides a buffer between Guiseley and Yeadon to prevent the merging of the two communities.

Site 4020 (HG2-4)

- This GB land was designated as a Special Landscape Area in the 2006 UDP. Development would be against that and would also destroy the setting it provides between the Tranmere Park Garden Village and the Park Gate Conservation Areas.
- It is valuable agricultural land with a Grade 2 listed building.
- Development would create urban sprawl as it would join BD17 with LS20.
- There would be major problems
- Problems with access and exit because it involves the busy highways and junction of the A6038, Hawksworth Lane and Park Road.
- I believe there are flooding issues on this site.
- There would be a loss of a wide variety of wild life if site developed.

Sites 1180A, 1311A, 2163A (HG2-5)

- This GB is partly within the GCA and the remainder adjoining it. Development would lead to the loss of this open space and erode the buffer zone it currently provides between Guiseley and Esholt.
- Access and exit would be a nightmare. Park Road is already extremely busy, Coach Road is at present largely unmade and Silverdale Avenue is relatively narrow and residents and visitors park their cars on both sides impeding traffic flow.

I therefore submit that the present SAP should not be implemented and that there should be full GB, housing needs and infrastructure reviews made with full cooperation with bodies such as ANF, town/parish councils heritage groups, etc.

Mrs Audrey Janet Dawson  
72 Southway, Tranmere Park, Guiseley, Leeds LS20 8JQ  
Tel: 01943 875470

Sent from my iPad

Sent from my iPad

Sent from my iPad