

**From:**  
**To:** [Site Allocations Plan](#)  
**Cc:** [Stuart Andrew.MP](#)  
**Subject:** PDE00790\_Planning proposals - Site Ref: HG2-12/HG2-41/HG3-2,3 & 4  
**Date:** 03 November 2015 18:22:55

---

Francoise 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 HG2-12** - I am writing to comment and strongly object to the proposed plans for houses to be built on the above mentioned sites. I completely disagree that 414 houses should be built in this GREENBELT area of Rawdon.

I live on Cragg Wood Drive, Rawdon and have done so for the last 8 years, infact I live in the same house that my grandparents lived in for 55 years. I have grown up in this area as I lived here for the first 5 years of my life and so I love the fact that we have the most wonderful countryside, historic character and wildlife so close to a major city. The fact that all this is preserved is due to the surrounding area being part of a conservation area and retaining the greenbelt land is a crucial and important feature for future generations. **For those reasons I DO NOT believe that the planned development is justified.** There has been no comprehensive greenbelt review, as required under Core Strategy.

**Development not justified – specifically HG2-12/HG2-41/HG3-3/HG3-4** - As a keen walker and someone who enjoys the countryside I am very concerned that entire wildlife habitats would be lost forever if this development goes ahead. We have wild deer, bats, numerous wild birds, badgers, newts, not to mention the mature protected trees, native bluebell woods, Ghyll Beck and all the wonderful hedgerows that surround these fields that are in danger of being destroyed. If these areas were to be built on, all this wildlife would have no natural habitat and the resulting consequences would be long lasting and detrimental. There is also a lot of Grade 3 farmland that will be lost forever – people are employed in the Rawdon area and they would lose their jobs. **Again for the above reasons I DO NOT believe that the planned development is justified.**

There are basic errors in the Councils site sustainability and greenbelt assessments for all sites. The A65 is always busy and could not support more traffic – it would be dangerous and there would be the potential for many more accidents. There are not enough schools, medical centres in the area to cope with such an influx of people and if a new school were to be built then there would definitely be grid-locked traffic on the A65 which would create chaos.

I believe that any new development to this scale should be being built on brown field sites – not GREENBELT land. LCC Core Strategy says itself that all brownfield sites must be developed

before greenbelt land.

**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 kept informed of the future developments with this outrageous plan.

Yours faithfully

Francoise Wilson