

**From:**  
**To:** [Site Allocations Plan](#)  
**Subject:** PDE00653\_The Core Strategy - Site Reference HGX- XX  
**Date:** 06 November 2015 16:17:16

---

I recognise that the significant growth in the population will require more housing. And I know that my house was farmland 60 years ago - but then most houses have been built on what was once open country. So, why not support LCC's Core Strategy? After all, the Government are demanding action from Leeds.

It is simply that the plan, as put forward, appears deeply flawed and erroneous. If this was a private company, the directors would expect a more reasoned argument, with an analysis of costs, benefits and a clear illustration of what were the alternatives. A full analysis of pros and cons. Frankly, the Strategy seems to fail in each area.

\*There is no attempt to illustrate the case FOR the Plan against other options.

\*Why is it deemed so essential to build on Green Belt? What is Green Belt if it can be built on? Does all or any Green Belt have NO value, NO status?

\*Horsforth and Rawdon are slowly choking. The A65 roundabout is going to be swamped again, soon. The costly work recently undertaken is akin to taking aspirin for a broken leg.

\*The Clariant site was approved, in part, because of the promise of affordable housing. But there isn't very much of that, is there? Housebuilders want to sell expensive houses on prime land - and why wouldn't they? So what proportion of affordable housing will any of these sites provide? Why is the ratio not set out? Is it because LCC will not be able to attract builders to build low priced units?

\*Can LCC satisfy us that their analysis of 70,000 houses holds good? Is the data current? Is 70,000 more accurate than the alternative figure of 45,000?

\*Will LCC spell out the alternative areas considered and the reasons for rejection? Why is there such a concentration in this area?

There could be a case for some small developments - say in HG2-43, HG2-45 and HG2-46. Otherwise, it seems very clear that there is to be NO indication of this Plan's being ESSENTIAL because there is NO SUITABLE ALTERNATIVE!

In 2010 a number of us gave freely of our time to produce The Horsforth Design Statement. We consulted widely in the area. I was on the 'team' and it was very clear that people welcomed maintaining the Green Belt and the Conservation Areas. LCC supported the process.

All of which prompts the question: 'what was the point?'

J G Mellor