

From:
To: [Site Allocations Plan](#)
Cc: [Stuart Andrew.MP](#); imran.hussain.mp@parliament.uk
Subject: PDE00125_Objection to greenbelt development in Rawdon_Horsforth area
Date: 31 October 2015 12:16:51

Paul Davies,
1 High Street Place,
Idle,
Bradford,
BD10 8NP

Dear Sir/Madam,

I'd like to strongly oppose the proposed developments in the Rawdon/Horsforth area. As I grew up in this area I believe I'm able to give valid reasons for not building/developing here.

Quick Site Reference:

HG3-4: Layton Lane, HG3-3: Knott Lane East, HG3-2: Knott Lane East, HG2-41: Rawdon Crematorium - Horsforth Roundabout, HG2-12: Woodlands Drive.

These developments are NOT justified because of the following reasons:

I often drive in this area and it's noticeable (particularly following the Horsforth roundabout development) that the traffic is stationary on the A65 from as early as 7am onwards tailing back all the way from Horsforth roundabout to almost Yeadon! It's quite clearly at full capacity now and more developments along the A65 are unsustainable, would be catastrophic for the area and dangerous.

I cycle along the A65 and it's noticeable with the increased traffic that it has become more hazardous for me to get to work in Leeds.

HG2-41 area with a school would contribute further to the all ready existing gridlock and make it virtually impossible to move around the area by car. This is worsened by the one-point access that leads into HG2-12.

I find myself increasingly considering emigrating as I believe the current policy to build/develop our precious greenbelt areas is a disaster that future generations will look back on with shame. The reduction in biodiversity in our city areas (e.g. I can't remember the last time I saw a hedgehog when I used to see them all the time when I was younger or the harm we seem to be causing to the bee population) is obvious when you travel to other countries that aren't as urbanised.

There has been no comprehensive greenbelt review as required under the core strategy. The whole point of greenbelt land was to prevent urban sprawl. I find it irksome that greenbelt development is allowed on the grounds that we need more houses in this country yet all the housing developments I see around Leeds/Bradford are for detached 3/4 bedroom houses - this is NOT affordable housing.

These developments will spoil the distinctive open valley views and special character of Rawdon village and the Leeds/Bradford green corridor. These areas are special to me because I walk dogs here, enjoy wildlife, exercise and I believe these green areas are part of what makes this area so attractive to live in.

All the development sites are within LCC's own designated Special Landscape Area. HG2-12 and HG2-41 would have an awfully detrimental visually impact to these areas.

These plans would destroy the Rawdon Cragg Wood conservation area. HG3-3 is within the conservation area and HG2-12 is within the immediate setting of the conservation area.

I see many sites around Leeds/Bradford area (brown field sites) that are not

being used or considered for development principally because of cost; it's much easier to build on a green field site. This is a shocking use of our land and must be seriously reconsidered before we devastate our little remaining green areas. The greenbelt areas of Leeds and Bradford prevent urban sprawl, maintain village identity and provide sanctuary for people away from a constant urban area. All the developments are in greenbelt!

As I use this area for walking my dog, cycling and enjoying nature (it's wonderful seeing deer so close to a major city) it would be a crime to lose this area for ever. It's part of the attraction of this area and why we are able to attract skilled professionals to Leeds/Bradford.

The Leeds Country Way runs through HG2-12 and alongside HG3-2 and HG3-3, this is a key recreational route which would be affected.

All the sites are part of LCC's own designated Strategic Green Infrastructure Area. HG2-12, HG3-3 and HG3-4 are UK Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitats.

These areas provide a sanctuary for wildlife which everyone can enjoy and are areas that we all must strive to protect. I've seen wild deer, bats and red kites in these areas and there are also fieldfare, tawny owls, sparrowhawks, lapwing and curlew in these areas.

Ghyll Beck runs next to HG3-4 Layton Lane fields and through HG3-3 and HG2-41. All sites contain protected mature trees and woodland which are a delight to walk through and enjoy, dramatically enhancing the lives of local people.

HG3-3 has a native bluebell wood and HG3-2 is adjacent to UK Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitat pond with palmate newts, also found in HG2-12.

There has been several basic errors in the Council's site sustainability and greenbelt assessments for all sites. This indicates to me that the impact on the sites hasn't been seriously considered and further reviews need to be performed to prevent irreplaceable damage to a wonderful area.

All sites are classified Grade 3 agricultural land. The several farms in the area are major employers in the village (which has a long-standing tradition of farming).

HG2-12, HG3-2 and HG2-41 are regularly farmed. HG3-3 is home to a family smallholding and a bee-keeper's apiary. It's important to not forget how tied to farming and wildlife that live on there we are. If we are serious about trying to reduce our carbon footprint we need to eat produce from local farms more than we do now. These farms in Rawdon contribute to this.

I'm worried that despite major flaws in the methodology of assessments (e.g. HG2-12 is allocated even though sustainability appraisal scores it -7!! - this is the worst of all nearby sites) these sites have still been planned.

Greenbelt assessment shows that HG2-12 has a greater impact compared with other sites, yet HG2-12 is allocated while nearby sites are safeguarded. This is at best lax and indicates a slack assessment process. Why has this occurred?

I hate the fact that potential alternative sites throughout the area have been overlooked. This indicates to me that areas of easiest potential to build on are being preferred to potentially more suitable sites. This is completely WRONG.

There aren't enough schools or supporting infrastructure to support these developments and the LCC core strategy says itself that all these must be developed before greenbelt land and they are not.

Also these sites are not justified because the council has not revised it's housing target in response to ONS projections which would mean the city needs 45,000 and NOT the current target of 70,000 properties. A reduction in 15,000 would remove the need to take any land out of greenbelt. This is a noticeable change in the housing target, lets protect our green areas that have an unquantifiable impact on the people of Leeds and Bradford.

These developments are NOT effective because of the following reasons:

The phasing of HG2-12 is UNDELIVERABLE. Highways access to HG2-12 is contingent on development of 'safeguarded' sites HG3-2 and HG3-3. But, HG2-12

is allocated for delivery earlier than these phase 3 sites. It has been incorrectly categorised as 'allocated' and CANNOT be delivered. This smacks of unprofessionalism and rushing of the assessment process. How can you not review properly such an important development.

The highways access is severely limited. There is only one access point into the HG2-12 site via Southlands Avenue for the HG2-12 development as the other roads are private. This is inadequate for 130 houses and will lead to tremendous strain. Knott Lane is barely suitable for additional development and frequent Crematorium traffic also uses Knott Lane affecting all of the 3 nearby sites. HG2-12, HG3-2 and HG3-3 would require realignment of Knott Lane but not serve them all adequately.

Access issues onto congested A65 would remain and further deteriorate with increased traffic from significant housing development dramatically affecting the quality of life for local people.

Significant surface water flooding which occurs in the HG2-12 area may make the site undeliverable.

These developments are NOT legally compliant because of the following reasons:

There has been NO consultation on the HG2-12 prior to it being allocated to housing in Site Allocation Plan. I find this fact shocking. Why hasn't this occurred?

HG2-12 was not included in Issues and Options consultation in June. Again, why has this not occurred? This development doesn't comply with the Statement of Community Involvement. Again this is a worrying fact.

I didn't realise that the council had held a public consultation in 2013 about their future plans. Was this a surreptitious meeting? Are the council trying to 'pull the wool' over our eyes and rush through these developments?

These developments are NOT positively prepared because of the following reasons:

The Site Allocations Plan for these Rawdon sites are NOT based on a comprehensive Greenbelt review as REQUIRED by the previous Inspector when he passed Core Strategy as sound.

The biased and flawed greenbelt review undertaken by Leeds City Council means the Core Strategy and Sites Allocations Plan are UNSOUND. There seems to have been a selective review of where housing should be developed by the Leeds City Council and I find this deeply disturbing.

These developments are NOT in accordance with the NPPF because of the following reasons:

By not considering alternatives (please see above) the council most definitely have not proved that 'exceptional circumstances' exist to outweigh the harm that development would cause to the greenbelt sites here. This goes against the whole point of the creation of greenbelt land and is a poor reflection on the state of the current Leeds City Council.

The Council say that 'growth' is the exceptional circumstance, but government ministers disagree. We need to accept that our old policies of continuing to build more and more is reaching its limit in our crowded country and a change of policy needs to occur. We can't in our small country continue how we always have as there is a finite amount of resources and these become increasingly precious as we become a more populous country.

The specific areas of the NPPF that the developments contradict include chapters 9: Protecting Greenbelt, 11: Conserving Natural Environment and 12: Conserving Historic Environment.

Thanks for reading in my e-mail. I believe that worldwide environmentally we are at a crucial tipping point and we seriously need to consider how we protect our green areas in order to preserve things for the future. We CANNOT carry on regardless - Paul Davies.

Sent from my iPad