

**From:**  
**To:** [Site Allocations Plan](#)  
**Cc:** [Stuart Andrew.MP](#)  
**Subject:** PDE00687\_Planning proposals - Site Ref: HG2-12/HG2-41/HG3-2,3 & 4  
**Date:** 05 November 2015 18:45:02

---

Mr S. A. Wilson  
Bracken Hill  
The Spinney  
Cragg Wood Drive  
Rawdon  
Leeds  
LS19 6LH

**FAO Leeds City Council Planning Department**  
**Planning proposals – Site Ref: HG2-12/HG2-41/HG3-2,3 & 4**

**Development not justified – specifically HG3-3 and HG2-12** I would like to oppose the Council's plans for the over development of new housing on the above mentioned sites. High volume affordable housing to this scale will not enhance and preserve the special character of this conservation area. In the council's own rule book on conservation, it clearly states there is greater control and restriction on developing within these areas. The local green-spaces and conservation areas are made up of crucial farmland, precious woodland and wildlife, not to mention the existing residents who have worked hard and invested heavily to live in such special areas, which are now under threat. **The local traffic has already reached saturation point.** These areas will no longer exist with their special characteristics if they disappear underneath large affordable housing estates.

**Why does the Council not choose to use sites in built-up areas, wasteland and Brownfield sites?**

Planners should consider using the estimated **610,000 empty homes** in England  
England also has enough Brownfield sites to cater for **960,000 new homes**

It is the Council's duty to consider choosing the above mentioned site options in Leeds and Bradford rather than taking the cheaper and easier option of building on the city's virgin surrounding land. There has been no comprehensive greenbelt review, as required under Core Strategy.

**There has already been a significant amount of new housing developed in the local area**

The former Stylo Barratt site at Apperley Bridge  
The former Sandoz site at Horsforth

While these sites have been a more sensible approach in terms of using Brownfield land, they still have a significant impact in terms of population/congestion within the Rawdon area.

It is my personal opinion that the council are avoiding other potential land sites which need

more expensive pre-build preparation and also choosing to build near or within exclusive areas which command a higher house-price value. Also the amount of new-build planning proposals is now off the scale for the size of the area. **Is the Council trying their luck in pushing forwards as many proposals as possible with very little notice to existing residents with the hope that some will succeed in getting through?**, if so this seems to me a very underhand tactic for a city's Council which should be working for the benefit of all it's residents.

**The development is not effective** because the 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 is limited – HG2-12 – only one access point into the site via Southlands Ave as the other roads are private – this is inadequate for 1309 houses. There would be congestion problems with access onto A65 from increased housing.

A large of surface water flooding in HG2-12 may make the site undeliverable.

**The development is not legally compliant** for the following reasons – there has been no consultation on site HG2-12 prior to it being allocated to housing in Site Allocations Plan. HG2-12 was not included in Issues and Options consultation in June. *NOT COMPLIANT* with Statement of Community Involvement.

**The development has not been positively prepared** as the **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**.

**The development is not in accordance with the NPPF**. Because the council has not considered alternatives, the council has not proved that 'exceptional circumstances' exist to outweigh the harm that development would cause to the above mentioned greenbelt areas. **Chapters 9 Protecting Greenbelt, 11 Conserving Natural Environment and 12 Conserving Historic Environment – National Planning Policy Framework**.

I would like to be informed on the progress of this matter.

Regards

Mr Simon Wilson