

From:
To: [Site Allocations Plan](#)
Subject: PDE00334_Consultation response HG2-12 HG2-41 HG2-43 HG3-2 HG3-3 HG3-4
Date: 18 October 2015 21:30:48

Dear Sir / Madam

Ref	Consultation
HG2-12	Woodlands Drive 130 houses
HG2-41	Rawdon crematorium to Horsforth roundabout
HG2-43	Horsforth Campus
HG3-2	Knott Lane West
HG3-3	Knott Lane East
HG-4	Layton Lane

I am writing to voice my concerns regarding the current site allocation consultation.

The consultation itself.

I wrote and emailed when the first site allocation consultation took place. I was advised that I would receive information about the next stages and have the opportunity to respond further in the future. I have received nothing from LCC. I have not been consulted in any way. If it had not been for Rawdon Parish Council I would not have even known about the consultation period. How many people have missed the opportunity to respond because of NO communication from LCC? The Council do not appear to have sought all opinions on this consultation.

Questions:

Have the plans been positively prepared?

Are the plans justified?

Will the plans be effective?

- The plans have not had the proper consultation. Therefore they have not been positively prepared.
- The initial housing numbers required and hence the extent to which the proposals are deemed necessary to venture into greenbelt are potentially overstated. Hence they are not justified.
- The priority should be to invest in brown field and non greenbelt land first so that if the numbers are revised downwards in 3 years, as promised by LCC, based on the 2011 census results (rather than 2008 estimates), then we will not already have built on greenbelt unnecessarily. So the plans are not justified.
- Has there been any collaboration with bordering councils e.g. Bradford Council to assess the impact of their plans on the local infrastructure. The Bradford postcodes bordering LS19 and beyond lead to more traffic on the main arterial routes into Leeds – the A65 being one of these. How many more cars are expected on the roads from these out of area postcodes and have these been factored in to the proposed site allocations?

- The effectiveness of the plans relies on the infrastructure being put in place as well as the houses being built. It appears the houses are built first and the infrastructure follows on afterwards or not at all. There are precedents set in other areas where conditions of planning dictate infrastructure projects are built e.g. new schools. These planning conditions have then been appealed by developers and never built. I would propose that because infrastructure projects are key to the effectiveness of the plans then these should be built first. The plans are not effective unless more prioritisation is built into the planning process and infrastructure projects are implemented first.

Is the plan consistent with national policy?

- All of the sites are greenbelt. In the sustainable development section of the NPPF regarding use of greenbelt it states – inappropriate development, harmful to green belt should not be approved except in **very special circumstances**. What are the special circumstances that allow the building of houses on greenbelt?
- The aim of sustainable development is to ensure that creating better lives for ourselves today does **not** negatively impact life for future generations. These proposed developments **do** take away greenbelt land which **will** have the following negative impacts for our future generations. These developments:
 - will increase urban sprawl,
 - will lose the local identity of Rawdon,
 - will increase the pressures on local roads - which cannot cope with the current developments (the A65/ring road 'improvements' are causing further chaos as of last Friday, after the traffic lights became operational)
 - will increase the pressures on local infrastructure (health services, local surgeries, schools) whilst
 - reducing the areas where our children can roam freely, walk the dog, pick blackberries, take a walk or cycle in the local area (without first having to drive the car to a location), talk a walk or cycle on paths, routes and roads with minimal traffic in the conservation area. All of these activities would either not be able to take place or would be in traffic congested areas.
 - will reduce the wildlife / bird population in the area and reduce biodiversity.
- It is also inconsistent with Leeds Core Strategy as well as the National Framework. The Leeds Core Strategy identifies areas listed as 'Strategic Green Infrastructure' yet they are now planning to build houses on these areas.

I urge you to reconsider and remove these greenbelt developments from the overall plan.

I also ask that **all** future greenbelt developments are placed last in the priority order of any building plans of the city. This will ensure we reuse and manage other brown field and non greenbelt sites effectively first.

Finally the planning conditions should be **pre** conditions, before building houses, rather than within a set period after completion of the house building. This should reduce any risk of developers using viability / lack of funds / ... etc as reasons for non compliance of any planning conditions.

I would appreciate an acknowledgment of receipt of this email and confirmation of the next steps.

Yours sincerely

Gill Newsome
15 Layton Lane
Rawdon
Leeds
LS19 6RQ

This e mail, its contents and any attachments are intended solely for the addressee(s) and are privileged and confidential. Unauthorised use, disclosure, dissemination, copying, printing or reliance on the contents of this e mail may give rise to legal action being taken.

If you have received this email in error please delete it from your system and contact us via return email. You should not copy or forward it on or otherwise use the contents, attachments or information in any way.

Although we have taken steps to ensure this email and attachments are free from viruses, we advise that in keeping with good computer practice the recipient must ensure that they are in fact virus free.

Save paper - Do you really need to print this email? If so, why not use recycled paper?