

PDHO1867

Part 1 - Your details

\*This information must be completed

Personal details / Client details

Title MR
First name\* ALAN
Last name\* RAY
Job title
Organisation
Address\* A2 TOWN STREET
MANOR FARM COURT
GUISELEY
Post code\* LS 20 9BT
Phone/Mobile
Email

Agent details

Only complete if you are an agent

Development Department
TO ACTION INFO FILE
16 NOV 2015
File Number

Part 2 - What comment do you wish to make?

Please use a separate response form for each site/ part of the Plan(s) you wish to comment on.

2.1. Which Plan do your comments relate to?

[X] Leeds Site Allocations Plan [ ] Aire Valley Leeds Area Action Plan

2.2. Which section of the Plan do your comments relate to?

a. A specific site/designation in the Plan
Site reference from the document or Map
(e.g. HG2-1 (3026))

HG2-2

HG2-2 (3029)

Do you agree with the proposed use of this site? [ ] Yes [X] No

Please tick all the themes you wish to comment on;

- [X] Ecology/Landscape/Tree(s) [X] Local services/facilities [X] Schools
[X] Conservation/Heritage [X] Loss of Greenbelt
[X] Highways/transport [ ] Site Boundary (please submit a revised boundary)
[X] Other (please specify) Poor consultation + lack of council consultation

Part 2.

- 2.1 The Plan your comments relate to:  
Leeds Site Allocation Plan
  - 2.2 you chose a) A specific site /  
designation in the Plan  
Site Reference: HG2-2  
Site Address: Wills Gill, Guiseley
- I do NOT agree with the proposed use of this site.

Part 3

- 3.1 I do NOT consider the Plan to be sound.
- 3.2 Tests of Soundness  
Positively Prepared  
Effective  
Justified  
Consistency with National Policy
- 3.3 Why you think the Plan is Unsound:  
Ecology / Landscape / Trees.  
In the assessment of 2023, the topography is described as sloping yet the description on the site says that it is flat!  
There are no separate comments about the ~~the~~ biodiversity of this site yet the neighbouring site 1255b is marked as 'high' but these two sites are all two halves of the same proposal and should be scored similarly.  
No account is taken of the rights of way over this land which are popular with hikers and dog walkers

②

The stream along the right of way is subject to flooding - though work has been undertaken to reduce the risk. Gwiseley requires a mix of housing (mainly towards the lower end). The more expensive properties accommodate 2 cars and cannot easily be afforded.

### Conservation / Heritage

There has not been an assessment by English Heritage or Natural England. This site overlaps the Gwiseley ~~Conservation~~ Conservation Area and the medieval field pattern will be overwhelmed by the proposed modern roads and housing. This alone should be grounds to reject the proposal as unjustified. Without 3029, 1255B would surely fail too.

### Greenbelt

There are 7 dwellings on the unadapted Mills Gill. The Planners apparently have seized on this and blotted in land on 3029/1255b to swallow up the greenbelt land backing onto Queensway. The Greenbelt assessment is unjustified and unsound. The Unrestricted Sprawl Conclusion is wrong because these two sites cannot be considered in isolation.

There is no 'rounding off' and the properties on Will Gill shouldn't be used this way.

~~Under~~ Under this proposal (2029/1255b) there is an obvious join between Guseley and Yeardon. The two sites form an important safeguarding function of preserving the setting of historic towns. This part of Greenbelt around Guseley has been considered unsuitable for housing until 2013. What changed then? Nothing has changed with the land.

Local services / facilities

The overall target for houses by Leeds is 74000 units. In order to build this many the Greenbelt must be swallowed up yet is well in excess of the NAPP figures. The figure is 50% + too high according to the Office of National Statistics.

A further 367 dwellings on Will Gill / Shaw Lane will impact on schools and medical facilities which are expanding to meet the current demand NOT future demand  
Highways / transport

The link of 1255b is a way of ensuring that the inadequate access

④

to the latter site is enhanced and the two sites should be considered as one. Traffic along Queensway is busy at all times and stationary during the rush hours. If expensive, 2 car houses are built here then, an additional 600 cars could be added to the traffic mix. What an appalling thought. Could the existing road pattern cope? How would the roads change?

What about public transport?  
 3/4 Changes you consider necessary to make the Plan sound!

It appears that 3029/1255 b are not 'positively prepared' as it

- ignores traffic issues
- is a grab of Green belt land
- inconsistent with NPPF so NO
- amendments can alter this
- Joins the historic towns of Guiseley and Yeadon by erasing the Greenbelt land separating them.

Part 4

4.1 Do you consider the Plan to be legally compliant?

Don't know

(5)

4.3

No Comment.

Part 5

Would you like to take part in  
the forthcoming Public Examination?  
No

Part 6

Future Updates  
6.1 Yes to both items.

Signed



A. N. RAY

13. 11. 15.