

**From:**  
**To:** [Site Allocations Plan](#)  
**Subject:** PDE00313\_Save Our Green Belt  
**Date:** 21 October 2015 11:05:05

---

>>  
>> Regarding Site Reference Numbers:  
>> Allocated:  
>> HG2 - 12 Woodlands Drive 130 Houses  
>> HG2 - 41. Rawdon Crematorium to Horsforth Roundabout 777 houses and school  
>>  
>> Safeguarded for 246 Houses:  
>> HG3 - 2 Knott Lane West  
>> HG3 - 3 Knott Lane East - ADJACENT CRAGG WOOD CONSERVATION AREA  
>> HG3 - 4 Layton Lane  
>>  
>> I was unaware that Leeds City Council held a public consultation regarding the above plans for this area in 2013 and was not aware that this current consultation was happening until told by a neighbour.  
>> Does this have to be kept a secret???  
>> Does Leeds really need 70,000 new houses by 2028? NO, if worked out on more recent research statistics the figure would be 45,000, so, why start grabbing Green Belt and Greenfield Sites.  
>> National Planning Policy Framework - NPPF  
>> Paragraph 79:  
>> The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts, it's fundamental aim being to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land PERMANENTLY open:  
>> To check unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.  
>> To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another.  
>> To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.  
>> To preserve the setting and special character of an area.  
>> To assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the use of derelict and other urban land.  
>> Paragraph 87:  
>> Inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except  
>> in very special circumstances.  
>> Paragraph 109:  
>> The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:  
>> Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes.  
>> Recognising the wider benefits of the ecosystem.  
>> Minimise impact on biodiversity.  
>>  
>> LEEDS COUNCIL SEEMS TO HAVE IGNORED ALL OF THE ABOVE Even though their CORE STRATEGY states all of the above, making these site allocations inconsistent with both national and their own established policy.  
>>  
>> LOST:  
>> Vital Green Belt would be lost for ever spoiling the rural character between Rawdon village and the Aire Valley, the only green area between the Leeds, the 3rd largest city in England and Bradford, the 6th largest city in England, making the largest urban sprawl in England.  
>> The A65 road is already full to capacity.  
>> LOST:  
>> Rawdon Cragg Wood conservation area.  
>> LOST:  
>> Area for walking, cycling, horse riding. The Leeds Country Way runs through HG2 - 12 and alongside HG3 - 2 and HG3 - 3, a key local recreational route.  
>> LOST:  
>> Wildlife Habitats of deer, badger, bats, foxes, field fare, lapwing, curlew, sparrow hawk and tawny owls.  
>>

>> Is any of this justified? NO  
>> Were the Rawdon Site Allocation Plans based on a comprehensive Green Belt Review? NO  
>> Is the development in accordance with the NPPF? NO  
>>  
>> We already have a very large housing development on the site of the former High Royds Hospital Menston, which comes under Bradford City Council, again increasing traffic on the A65 which is already full to capacity and putting further pressure on local schools, hospitals, GP surgeries and now Leeds City Council is planning the same.  
>> Do these two councils communicate with each other???  
>> Plus HG1 - 96 and the Clariant development already underway on the Leeds ring road between Rodley and Horsforth.  
>>  
>> DO WE WANT MORE? NO  
>>  
>> Has Leeds City Council given due consideration to Brownfield sites in a Leeds which would accommodate 25,000 houses???  
>>  
>> I would like Leeds City Council to refuse planning in all these afore mentioned areas in perpetuity for future generations.  
>>  
>> Denise Heald  
>> Lisieux Lodge,  
>> Woodlands Drive,  
>> Rawdon,  
>> LS19 6JZ