

**From:**  
**To:** [Site Allocations Plan](#)  
**Subject:** PDE00134\_LSAP& AVLAAP PUBLIC CONSULTATION – FORMAL OBJECTION  
**Date:** 30 October 2015 10:55:03

---

Karen Sudbury  
46 Victoria Drive  
Horsforth  
Leeds  
LS18 4PW  
29 October 2015

Dear Sir/Madam,

LSAP& AVLAAP PUBLIC CONSULTATION – FORMAL OBJECTION

I wish to make you aware of my objections to the proposed development of greenbelt and green field sites:

- HG2-41 (4240) - Fields South of A65 from Horsforth & Rawdon RA to crematorium
- HG2-42 (1016) - Fields at Broadway and Calverley Lane, Horsforth
  - **HG2-43 (5009) - Fields at Horsforth College Campus**
  -

I live close to the sites of proposed development and I believe that the proposed developments on greenbelt protected land will have a serious negative impact on my standard of living, on the local environment and on local wildlife and should be excluded from the plans. My specific objections are as follows:

## 1. Inconsistent with National Planning Policy Framework

I. INADEQUATE ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINT: NPPF states that the target level of **housing development within the plans should be capped in line with the capacity of brown field sites to accommodate it**, to protect and enhance greenbelt. The current plans significantly exceed this capacity, resulting in the permanent destruction of greenbelt.

II. NON-EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCE: NPPF states that greenbelt is to be protected and requires exceptional circumstances to be built on. There is **nothing exceptional about the Council's plans to build on greenbelt land** to meet their current housing target. Its adoption of the self imposed Core Housing Strategy cannot be considered to be an exceptional set of circumstances, but is merely part of their scheduled housing building policy plan.

III. PRIORITISATION OF GREENBELT OVER BROWN FIELD: NPPF states

that **brown field sites should be prioritised over the development of green field and greenbelt, but these plans offer up greenbelt as a first option.** The range of larger sites are scheduled for phase one in advance of many brown field which are allocated for housing. The greenbelt allocated for housing has also been selected in favour of all of the other available brown field land from across the region, which is yet to be included in the site allocation plan.

IV. LACK OF INFRASTRUCTURE: NPPF states that infrastructure must come first, yet the **outline ideas to provide infrastructure are neither in place or time-lined in advance of the proposed developments.** There are currently no plans whatsoever to develop new healthcare with these very large scale extensions of population. There is a limited attempt to set aside land for education but no schedule of timed completion and no consideration of who would build a school on this land. It seems to me this would not be progressed and would end up being turned into more housing for this over stretched population.

## **2. Inconsistent with Leeds Development Plan Policies**

I. LACK OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING: The **need for large scale affordable housing and single owner properties will not be fulfilled by developing on sites on greenbelt land in semi-rural areas.** This is possible by the renewal of brown field land in areas in need of urban regeneration and investment. For example the sites listed above are in areas which command property values for new build currently starting at circa £325,000 (eg: Horsforth Vale); which in no way prioritises the progression of affordable housing. The small percentage set aside for affordable housing within these premium area developments only scratches the surface of the problem and fails meaningfully to address the issue.

II. DENIAL OF NEED FOR HOUSING TARGET RE-ASSESSMENT: The **current housing target** which drives the need to develop on the greenbelt is flawed and needs to be changed. It is based on outdated, over inflated housing targets which require that over 66,000 new properties are still needed. This **needs to be brought in line with the latest 2014 figures from the Office of National Statistics,** which show a need for only 46,000 new homes.

III. DELAYING OF NEED FOR HOUSING TARGET RE-ASSESSMENT: In order to prevent the unnecessary permanent destruction of greenbelt, the current plan to **re-assess the housing target** needs to be put in place **before the site allocation plans are progressed,** and not after them as currently planned.

## **3. Negative Impact on Highway Safety and Traffic:**

I. COMPROMISING ON SAFETY: The above sites are located on a section of Ring Road and the A65 which is one of the most congested and dangerous in Leeds. Adding over a thousand extra houses which all need to utilise this same stretch of road will cause **gridlock and increase the risk of serious accidents** within this over burdened area.

II. INABILITY TO COPE WITH TRAFFIC: The adjoining section of

Ring Road (A6120) leading out of the areas of the sites named above is bottlenecked between three separate single lane bridges (one railway, one canal and one river). Therefore the ability of these sites to accommodate **extra houses must be limited in line with the ability to deliver proper infrastructure to serve them**. The two new train stations are very welcome but unrealistically distant from the proposed new housing to be of use to new residents.

#### **4.Lack of Conservation of the Natural Environment:**

I.DESTRUCTION OF HABITATS: The above sites are home to crested newts, different species of bats, owls, hawks, wild deer, badgers and a huge array of wildlife that will perish as a result of the proposed development. While there may be token provision allocated for selected species, the majority are not even noted or recognised in the **inadequate environmental impact assessments** which have been conducted to date.

II.ISOLATION OF WILDLIFE: The above sites provide a continuous chain of greenbelt along the River Aire Valley, which allows the **wildlife migratory and residential access** across the region. The destruction of these greenbelt sites will lead to their isolation, hemmed in by the proposed housing and Ring Road, leading to their **permanent demise from the area**.

III.REMOVAL OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT WITH COUNTRYSIDE: Site HG2-41 (4240) is used both as **working agricultural land and also as Pick Your Own fruit fields**. During the fruit picking season, the fields provide thousands people from the local community with a meaningful way to connect with the natural environment. Hundreds of families such as my own, many with small children, pick their own strawberries and raspberries each week on this site.

On these and other grounds, I sincerely hope that you are able to act and reject the progression of these greenbelt sites within the development proposals. Please keep me informed of the public examinations, submission of the plans and potential outcome of the review.

Yours faithfully,

Karen Sudbury