

From:
To: [Site Allocations Plan](#)
Subject: PDE00580 OBJECTIONS TO PLANNING PROPOSALS IN FAWDON/HORSFORTH
Date: 08 November 2015 20:00:26

Dear Sirs

OBJECTION TO

SITES:

HG2-12 – FIELDS AT WOODLANDS DRIVE, RAWDON,

HG3-2, HG3-3, HG3-4 –

FIELDS OFF A65 RAWDON

HG2-41 – FIELDS SOUTH OF A65,

HORSFORTH ROUNDABOUT TO THE CREMATORIUM

HG2-43

FIELDS AT HORSFORTH COLLEGE CAMPAS

I am emailing to express my objection to the above proposals for building. I would set out my reasons as below

The Special Landscape Area would be lost by spoiling distinctive open valley views and rural character of Rawdon village and Leeds/Bradford green corridor. All sites are within the Council's own designated Special Landscape Area. [HG2-12](#) and [HG2-41](#) would have particular visual impact.

Rawdon Cragg Wood conservation area would be lost by marring its setting and views which are intrinsic to its historic character as enshrined in Cragg Wood Conservation Area Appraisal. [HG3-3](#) is within the conservation area, and [HG2-12](#) within the immediate setting of conservation area.

There has been no comprehensive greenbelt review, as required under Core Strategy.

Vital area of greenbelt forever lost blurring the gap between Leeds and Bradford, encroaching into our open countryside. This is unplanned urban sprawl. Rawdon's village identity gone. All sites in Greenbelt. This area has already had its fair share of urban "sprawl". For example, Yeadon Rawdon and Guiseley are more or less merged into one, as are Horsforth and Cookridge.

Strategic Green Infrastructure of Aire Valley would be lost restricting enjoyment of area for walking, cycling, horse-riding and harming nature and ecology. Leeds Country Way runs through [HG2-12](#) and alongside [HG3-2](#) and [HG3-3](#), a key regional recreational route. All sites part of Leeds City Council's own designated Strategic Green Infrastructure Area.

A65 FULL and over-capacity

Concentrating more developments along A65 is unsustainable, dangerous and would be disaster for area. [HG2-41](#) with a school would cause gridlock at ring-road. Worsened by one-point access into [HG2-12](#), [HG3-2](#) and [HG3-3](#) from unsuitable Knott Lane. Limited mitigation measures. I personally travel along the A65 to work every day and it is a nightmare. The new traffic lights have actually made the situation worse. Drivers now try to avoid the A65 by driving up to Rawdon Town Street and then on to Horsforth. Since the traffic lights have been installed Rawdon Town Street has also regularly been gridlocked with queues forming in Rawdon Town Street, down Brownberrie Lane to the Old Ball at Horsforth. Please also bear in mind that this traffic goes past St Peters School and also passes close to Horsforth School. We desperately need a decent infrastructure now and new houses should not even been considered in this area as the roads can just not cope. I would prefer to take a bus to work but the buses are just caught up in exactly the same traffic and it can take over an hour to do 8 miles. I would also like to take the train but the nearest station is 3 miles away – as mentioned above the traffic to Horsforth is now horrendous and it can take 25 minutes to drive 3 miles. When you reach the station there is only parking for 50 cars which is nowhere near enough. You have no alternative but to park on the road, outside somebody's house which as you can imagine does not go down very well at all. Again we need better infrastructure not more houses.

In my opinion if the new houses are built it will be common place for the roads to be gridlocked in Rawdon and Horsforth as they already are in rush hour. Guiseley is an example of this and with the new developments there this has caused permanent traffic jams in that area.

I would also be concerned at the danger to children with extra traffic passing by schools and a further consideration is the additional pollution caused by the traffic.

Wildlife habitats LOST

[HG2-12](#), [HG3-3](#) and [HG3-4](#) are UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) Priority Habitats, hosting wild deer, bats, fieldfare, lapwing, curlew, sparrow hawk, tawny owl. Ancient 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. [HG3-3](#) has a native bluebell wood. [HG3-2](#) is adjacent to UK BAP Priority Habitat pond with palmate newts, also found in [HG2-12](#). I have also seen Red Kites in the area which I believe are a protected species.

Grade 3 farmland LOST

All sites classified Grade 3 agricultural land. Rawdon's several farms are major employers in the village which has a rich farming heritage. [HG2-12](#), [HG3-2](#) and [HG2-41](#) are regularly farmed. [HG3-3](#) home to family's smallholding and a bee-keeper's apiary.

I believe that there are major flaws in the Council's site sustainability and greenbelt assessments for all sites.

Major flaws in methodology of assessments eg [HG2-12](#) allocated even though sustainability appraisal scores it -7, the worst of all nearby sites. Greenbelt Assessment shows greatest impact compared with other sites, yet [HG2-12](#) is allocated while nearby sites safeguarded. Why?

There are not enough school places and local schools heavily over-subscribed.

Potential alternatives have been overlooked:

North East Bradford - has the Council worked with Bradford Council to look at joint plan for bordering towns and villages?

There are several sites particularly in the Apperley Bridge area which has also started construction. This will certainly add to the issues for the infrastructure. As this is in the same area – only a couple of miles away – did the two Councils sit down together and was the impact of the total number of new houses considered.

Brownfield sites ARE available **elsewhere across** Leeds. The Council's Core Strategy says itself that all these must be developed before greenbelt land.

The Council has not revised its housing target in response to revised ONS projections which would mean city needs 45,000 and not current target of 70,000 - on which Council based its Core Strategy. A reduction in target of just 15,000 would remove need to take any land out of greenbelt.

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.

Highways access LIMITED

[HG2-12](#): Only one access point into site via Southlands Avenue as other roads private, inadequate for 130 houses. Knott Lane is barely suitable for additional development. Frequent Crematorium traffic also uses Knott Lane, affecting all three sites close by.

[HG2-12](#), [HG3-2](#) and [HG3-3](#): Would collectively 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 developments.

Significant surface water flooding in [HG2-12](#) may make site undeliverable.

Development NOT legally compliant

No consultation on site [HG2-12](#) PRIOR to it being allocated to housing in Site Allocations Plan.

[HG2-12](#) not included in Issues and Options consultation in June.

NOT COMPLIANT with Statement of Community Involvement.

I believe that the council held a public consultation about your plans in 2013. I did not know that this was happening – I did not receive a letter or any other type of communication – I did not see it in the local papers and I cannot recall seeing any notices. Please advise why the Council think I was informed. The only way I know about the proposals if via the Action Groups on Social Media.

All I have seen is some very small notices by some fields in Cragg Woods. It is not clear what these notices are as some just have numbers on it – there are no details as to what is proposed on these sites/numbers of houses etc and nor are there any contact details. Surely this cannot be classed as consultation – the only reason I saw the signs is because I regularly cycle – the signs are at on fields by the sides of tracks and on dead end roads and would not be seen by the majority of the local population.

I understand however, that there have been regular consultations with large building companies. Please let me know why there have been such consultations when the local residents do not appear to have been afforded the same.

Development NOT positively prepared

Site Allocations Plan for these Rawdon sites are not based on a comprehensive Greenbelt review **as required by previous Inspector when he** passed Core Strategy as sound.

The selective (and flawed) greenbelt review undertaken by Leeds City Council means the Core Strategy and Site Allocations Plan are **UNSOUND**.

Development NOT in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework

Especially chapters 9 Protecting Greenbelt, 11 Conserving Natural Environment and 12 Conserving Historic Environment.

By not considering alternatives, the Council has not proved that *'exceptional circumstances'* exist to outweigh the harm that development would cause to the greenbelt sites here. The Council say that *'growth'* is the exceptional circumstance, but government ministers disagree.

Conservation and Heritage

Conservation areas are areas of special architectural or historic interest. Designation makes sure that change is managed so that the special character of the area and its setting is preserved or enhanced.

The Cragg Wood Conservation Area is protected through the Rawdon Cragg Wood Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (2012), which means that it is a material consideration in the determination of planning decisions.

I think that for the above reasons building on the scale as outlined in the Councils would be a disaster for this area.

I look forward to receiving your response.

Yours faithfully

ANDREW INGHAM
32 MARKHAM AVENUE
RAWDON
LEEDS
LS19 6NF