

**From:** .  
**To:** [Site Allocations Plan](#)  
**Cc:** [Stuart Andrew.MP:](#)  
**Subject:** PDE01040\_Objections to site allocations plan (SAP)  
**Date:** 16 November 2015 01:43:18

---

Mr Jonathan Yeomans

42 Layton Lane,  
Rawdon  
Leeds  
LS19 6RG

Specific site HG3-4

Additional sites HG3-2, HG3-3, HG2-12, HG2-41

### **Highways/transport**

**A65** The A65 would routinely be better described as a car park than an A-road. Both before and after the modifications to the roundabout at the ring road, there have been significant queues along the A65, stretching back as far as Well Lane or beyond. Leeds City Council has clearly failed to demonstrate that it is capable of managing the existing traffic levels and adding additional homes along the A65 to the West of the ring road will inevitably make the problem worse.

**Layton Lane** This road is frequently used as part of rat runs to avoid the A65 traffic management problems. The route is unsuitable for speeding commuters but would become more congested and dangerous with the introduction of additional housing and therefore hundreds of additional car journeys both morning and evening.

**Layton Road to Bayton Lane** This road is also significantly used in rat runs in addition to the traffic which uses it as the most direct and appropriate route. In particular, the junction at the end of Bayton Lane is the scene of frequent road traffic accidents. Again, these problems will be exacerbated by additional housing and therefore traffic.

**Brownberry Lane** Again, this road cannot cope with the existing volume of traffic as evidenced by the daily traffic queues which must be negotiated by large numbers of school children.

**Proposed airport link road** The positioning of this unrequired proposal is unsound. It will lead to even more congestion at the A65/ringroad roundabout. The modifications of this roundabout have failed to deal with the existing traffic and to add more traffic without demonstrating a solution to the existing problems will be damaging. The current problems with traffic extend journey times and lead to unnecessary pollution. Additional traffic will make this worse and added pollution will damage the health of residents. It is also likely that more road traffic will be followed by more road traffic accidents.

### **Local services**

The plans publicised to date do not take into account the additional strain to be placed on local services due to increased population. No clear indications have been given that fire, police and ambulance services will be sufficient. No plan for additional shops, health centres and community centres have been indicated.

### **Schools**

Local schools are already over subscribed and without additional space for expansion. It is unreasonable to expect existing schools to accommodate additional pupils as this will affect the culture and running of the school.

### **Ecology/landscape/trees**

The area marked for destruction in this plan is greenbelt land which provides numerous resources for many species. In particular, the plan will contravene the many national and international bat protection agreements (eg Wild mammals protection act, Eurobats agreement, Bern convention Appendix II, Bonn convention Appendix II, WCA, conservation of habitats and species regulations 2010, CROW act 2000 and NERC act 2006). Bats both roost and feed in the designated area and will be killed if building is permitted. Please supply contact details for the named ecologist investigating this issue.

The Ghyll Beck boundary of HG3-4 and the fields themselves provide critical transit routes for a variety of species (including deer). Deer also use this area to house fawns whilst the does are feeding. Development of this site will, therefore, have damaging ecological effects far beyond the site itself

### **Conservation/heritage**

It is part of my cultural heritage to live on the outskirts of a city. I, along with many others have chosen to live in Rawdon for the nature of its environment. I object to the attempt to change the nature of Rawdon by the expansion of the urban sprawl of the Leeds/Bradford conurbation.

### **Loss of greenbelt**

The suggestion of development of greenbelt land ahead of brownfield sites is in direct contravention of national planning guidance. The greenbelt land is an integral feature of the local society and culture. The space it affords contributes to the health and well-being of the local people.

### **Summary**

Is the plan justified? No

The use of greenbelt land for development ahead of brownfield contravenes the LCC core strategy as well national strategies. This major fault calls into question the aims of the plan. The spurious figure of 70,00 homes being required ignores ONS projections and is used to justify use of greenbelt land.

Is the plan effective? No

The plan places housing away from the logical locations close to central Leeds employment opportunities. Brownfield sites could solve this.

Is the plan legally compliant? No

The plan does not comply with National Planning Policy Framework policies. Numerous wildlife

protection acts would be contravened.