

From:
To: [Site Allocations Plan](#)
Cc:
Subject: PDE00587_Proposed development within Rawdon Greenbelt.
Date: 08 November 2015 17:14:10

I am writing this email on behalf of the Maplesden family of 3. St. Josephs Court, Woodlands Drive , Rawdon, Leeds LS19 6JZ

We have been following in detail the proposed plans to re- develop sites within the Greenbelt areas of Rawdon and Horsforth. We have purposely avoided raising our objections until we were aware of all of the facts. As a family we are not immediately affected by the aesthetics of the proposed development but conclude we will be affected by the impact on the local infra- structure.

However, after much further research we conclude it is not about how it affects us personally but about the effect on the local communities of Rawdon and Horsforth as well as the environment. We are fiercely opposed to the plans based on the following.

The sites of concern are HG-12 Fields at Woodlands Drive where 130 houses are proposed. We believe there is no reasonable justification for building houses in an area within Rawdon Cragg Wood Conservation area. This is an area of natural beauty and more importantly a natural environment for wildlife habitats. The UK Biodiversity Action Plan earmarks this area for hosting woodland deer, bats, fieldfare, lapwing ,curlew, tawny owl. All are important to both the natural eco - system.

A special landscape area would be destroyed by eliminating views and the rural character of Rawdon Village. Indeed all developments in the proposal would create a sprawling ugly conurbation losing the community feel and look of the village- like residential areas of Rawdon and Horsforth

All areas in proposal fall in Greenbelt . How can such proposals be justified when there are readily available brownfield sites in Leeds?

It is our understanding there are major flaws in assessments of sites in particular HG2-12. This scored-7 ranking it one of the worst sites . This has already been allocated despite greenbelt assessments showing it has the greatest impact by comparison to other sites. Please could you reply by justifying this and not ignore this comment?

We do not believe the development of HG2-12 is effective or deliverable. Highways access to HG2-12 is contingent on the development of safeguarded sites i.e. HG3-2 and HG3-3. But you have designated HG2-12 to be developed earlier why? Please reply and justify.

HG2-12 has one access point on site via Southlands Avenue. Other roads are private. Southlands Avenue and Knott Lane are not suitable for additional development nor traffic. Access onto A65 at peak times is already limited with several cars queueing on Knott Lane unable to access A65- this will only be made worse. Knott Lane is a difficult road to navigate when we have ice and snow with cars often struggling to ascend the slope. Further development of other sites along A65 would only result in more congestion on what is a busy road used by commuters to Leeds and school run traffic.

We would also question how the local infra- structure within proposed development would cope with such a demand. Not just traffic but schools and local services such as NHS Doctors and Dentists.

On behalf of the residents of Knott Lane and Southlands Avenue We raise objections to the value of their houses being negatively impacted by the construction of houses. The development will rob them of views, light and peaceful tranquility. Whilst they may not have a legal right to this they have purchased houses at a premium price to enable them to achieve such a location . Will they be suitably compensated by the developer or indeed the farmer selling the land? We suspect not. We am happy to discuss further objections but conclude by stating the development is not legally compliant,there are flaws suggesting it is not positively prepared and not in accordance with the NPPF.

Regards
Maplesden Family.
Sent from my iPad