

PDH01095

Michael Scott

2 Netherfield Drive

Guiseley

Leeds

LS20 9DF

9/11/15

DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT			
To	ACTION	into	File
12 NOV 2015			

LDF Publication Draft Consultation
Forward Planning & Implementation
The Leonardo Building
2 Rossington Street
Leeds LS2 8HD

Response to LDF Publication Draft Consultation, Leeds Site Allocation Plan

Section HG-2-1 (3026) New Birks Farm Ings Lane Guiseley

I disagree with this site being used for housing

I do not consider the Leeds site allocation plan sound

I appreciate the wider need for additional housing and have not protested against previous developments but after witnessing Guiseley being over-developed and traffic grinding to a halt over the last 5 years I believe that this proposal is not suitable for Guiseley / Aireborough.

1. The Plan is Not Justified

- It is my understanding that there has not been a comprehensive greenbelt review as was asked for by the inspector of the core strategy.
- Other than a single questionnaire communities have not been involved in the drawing up of the plans
- For each site LCC's sustainability appraisal has not researched how each site will impact on the community and how new and existing residents will access facilities. There is no comprehensive transport review - all that seems to be mentioned is the A65 and a plan to mitigate it via horsforth roundabout.

2. The Plan is not positively prepared

It is clear to anyone living here that there are simply not enough facilities to cope with the additional proposed houses across the whole of Aireborough -

i) Transport Infrastructure

This is my main concern with the proposals. The transport infrastructure is already at breaking point due to the developments across Guiseley and the High Royds development in Menston, over the last 5 years. During rush hour and on weekends in particular Guiseley's roads are grid-locked and there are congestion/safety issues with unsuitable parking.

The A65 congestion has been recognised by Councillor Richard Lewis's comments on Look North and the recent proposals for an A65 relief road to Leeds/Bradford Airport.

Lack of credible transport reviews have taken place. The detail in the report(s) is very high level and focusses almost entirely on the A65 and none of the surrounding roads – there is no assessment of the local challenges of site access and extra traffic that will be generated.

Due to the aggregation of the recent developments and proposed Ings Lane, Banksfield, and Shaw Lane developments, Queensway will be significantly impacted by the proposals by introduction of more people/cars combined with people using it to avoid A65.

Ings Lane is already heavily congested as an escape from the A65. The proposed Ings Lane, Coach Street and Menston developments will cause traffic to use Ings Lane & Netherfield Road leading to even more congestion and make what are meant to be suburban roads main thoroughfares – impacting safety through lack of formal crossings on Ings Lane and Netherfield Road.

Due to on-road parking and bends, Ings Lane is already hard to navigate – especially at junction with A65. Even more traffic on this road is in my view dangerous.

On Guiseley AFC match days, Ings Lane and the junction with A65 and Back Lane are already heavily congested and dangerous with volume of traffic/on-road parking. This will become worse with further traffic levels due to proposed houses and the recent approval of stadium development.

Additional traffic from Coach Road development alongside wider Guiseley & Yeadon development will cause even further challenges at the Morrisons and gyratory junctions.

I see no assessment / mitigation of any of these concerns in the plans - The impact assessment discusses using funds for Horsforth roundabout with no indication as to how that would make slightest difference to the issues described above

As a father of two daughters walking to school via Netherfield Road, Ings Lane and A65 I believe the impact of the additional traffic presents a significant safety hazard for which no mitigation is presented. Ings Lane is already an obstacle course due to parking and the narrow bridge whilst Netherfield Road acts as a race track for speeding drivers.

Beyond the roads, the impact on train services has not been taken into account. The trains to/from Leeds in rush hour are already at capacity. Additional houses on Ings Lane near the station would encourage significant additional usage – how this would be mitigated is not clear. Again this is an example of lack of Leeds/Bradford co-operation as the trains would also gain more passengers from the proposed Menston development.

ii) Facilities

It is already impossible to get an NHS dentist in Guiseley and it is becoming increasingly difficult to get a Doctor's appointment due to sheer volumes of people.

It is not clear on how the impact on Guiseley School will be handled – the recent upsurge in primary school places / additional primary school facilities will be added to by the proposed houses and demand will feed downstream into the secondary school.

The larger schools without any additional parking facilities further exasperate the road issues.

The development of the two retail centres in Guiseley have added significantly to the traffic issues – the additional housing will further exacerbate the parking/congestion issues in the two centres and at Morrisons.

3. The Plan is not Effective

I cannot see any evidence of joined up thinking between Leeds and Bradford councils. Planned developments in Yeadon / Rawdon / Otley combined with those at Menston, and Apperley Bridge will impact the A65 and all surrounding roads in aggregate. I cannot see any consideration of this in the proposals or the impact on facilities such as dentists and doctors.

Looking at the 5 official green-belt purposes, I cannot see how the proposed HG-2-1 (3026) Ings Lane site isn't compatible with these

- The proposed site splits up Guiseley and Menston and restricts unrestricted sprawl of built up areas.
- It prevents Menston and Guiseley merging into one another
- With its home to diverse fauna an active agricultural land, the site supports safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
- Trees with preservation orders have been identified as supporting preserving the setting and special character of historic towns

The proposed development would break these purposes.

4. The plan is not legally compliant

a) Duty of community involvement

Other than a previous questionnaire I cannot see any community involvement in the identification of the plans.

I do not believe any real genuine attempt has been made to engage with local community. –

The only reason there has been recent engagement has been through the various non-LCC social media sites - without these I would have had no idea that this final consultation was in place and no idea what my rights were / factors to base any challenge on.

The single physical consultation meeting was not advertised, other than by the social media sites / local pressure groups – no communication was received from LCC regarding the event and it was not publicised in the local area

No communications / packs have been received from LCC with the proposals and there has been a reliance on people having internet access to view the plans which may not be the case for some of the elderly demographic in particular.

b) Fulfilment of duty to co-operate

As indicated in a number of examples above there is no evidence that co-operation with Bradford has taken place to assess the impact on Aireborough which is a fringe area and will be impacted by the combined effect of the Leeds and Bradford proposals.

There has not been a comprehensive green belt review as was asked for by inspector for core strategy.

To make the plan sound LCC could -

- Reduce the overall target
- Reduce the footprint of the proposed development by building smaller types of houses/flats required – affordable housing/older people downsizing
- Have an infrastructure plan in place prior to development – in particular covering non-A65 roads and measures such as speed humps / cameras on Netherfield Road and indications of how parking will be supported and traffic can actually move through Aireborough freely
- Consider other brownfield locations with better facilities/closeness to key areas of employment – an example would be around the new Kirkstall station or greenfield sites in less populated areas such as around Leeds/Bradford airport.
- Carry out a full comprehensive green-belt review
- Produce a joint plan with Bradford council

I would like acknowledgement of my response and to be informed of the submission of the plan for public examination and/or adoption

Yours Faithfully

Michael Scott