

**From:**  
**To:** [Site Allocations Plan](#)  
**Cc:** [Stuart Andrew.MP](#)  
**Subject:** PDE01378\_Site Allocations Plan - Rawdon, Horsforth and Yeadon  
**Date:** 15 November 2015 15:41:07

---

Dear Sirs,

I am deeply concerned about the proposed plans for housing development in the Rawdon / Horsforth area. I understand that the preferred method to make an objection is using the "online form in : [www.leeds.gov.uk/yourcity](http://www.leeds.gov.uk/yourcity)" but it looks quite daunting. I am therefore composing my objections in an email.

I have read that Leeds City Council needs to know why I think the Plan is not appropriate and that I need to comment on its soundness. The terms that are used are not familiar to me, however I have tried to phrase my comments under the topics mentioned in the test of soundness.

### **Positively prepared**

I am not convinced that the development of site references HG2-10, HG2-12, HG2-41, HG2-42, HG2-43 will be in line with section 4.8 (Green Belt) of the Adopted Core Strategy, especially paragraph 4.8.4 which states that the Green Belt boundary should remain in place over a long period and should only be changed in exceptional circumstances. Whilst there are alternative locations that are available for housing development I do not consider the changing of Green Belt boundaries to permit building on this precious land to be an exceptional circumstance.

Paragraph 4.8.5 does anticipate that some land will need to be taken out of the Green Belt. This is to permit Leeds to respond to population growth and demographic change. I understand that Leeds has a target to build 70,000 homes and that this is based in part on data from the Office for National Statistics (ONS) from 2008. I am aware that there are alternative, revised projections including ONS data from 2011 which show the real requirement to be below 50,000. If the requirement for new houses is actually 20,000 less than the current target there will be no need to build on Green Belt. Has the figure of 70,000 been corroborated against the latest ONS data and is the figure the likely projection or has a contingency been added?

Referring to Spatial Policy 10: Green Belt, item iv) states that

"Sites will be assessed against the purposes of including land in Green Belts identified in national guidance (National Planning Policy Framework). These purposes are:

- to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas,
- to prevent neighbouring towns from merging,
- to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment ,
- to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns and
- to assist in urban regeneration."

It is interesting to note that the final point has been abbreviated. The original point in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) reads " to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land"

The Green Belt relating to the proposed developments HG2-10, HG2-12, HG2-41, HG2-42, HG2-43 provides for these purposes and removing these areas from Green Belt is counter to the requirements of the Adopted Core Strategy. Since there is no evidence to show that all other alternatives have been exhausted these proposals are also counter to the NPPF.

Paragraph 2.38 of the Adopted Core Strategy describes the way in which green corridors stretch from the surrounding countryside into the heart of the main urban area as being one of the City's distinguishing features. And paragraph 2.41 states that the District's distinctive landscape character needs to be respected, conserved and enriched. The combined effects of the proposed developments HG2-10, HG2-12, HG2-41, HG2-42, HG2-43 and the developments HG3-2, HG3-3 & HG3-4 on safe guarded land would diminish the effect of green corridors around the ring road and along the A65, one of the main routes into Leeds. In this respect these development are counter to the requirements of the Adopted Core Strategy and the NPPF.

The combined effects of the proposed developments HG2-12, HG2-41, HG2-42, HG2-43, HG3-2, HG3-3 & HG3-4 will act to merge Rawdon (already merged with Yeadon and Guiseley) with Horsforth which is counter to the requirements of the Adopted Core Strategy and the NPPF.

Paragraph 2.13 states that " One of the biggest challenges Leeds faces is to provide enough quality and accessible homes to meet the City's growing population, whilst protecting the quality of the environment and respecting community identity. Within this overall context the need for affordable housing and affordable warmth are key issues ". This indicates that providing houses that are affordable and accessible to households needing to progress in the housing market is important to the Core Strategy. The proposed developments (HG2-10, HG2-12, HG2-41, HG2-42, HG2-43, HG3-2, HG3-3 & HG3-4) are situated in desirable locations by virtue of their proximity to countryside (much of it being recreational), views across the Aire river valley and access to commuter routes. As such the resulting properties will command a considerable price premium and would not then be affordable or accessible to those most in need. Permitting these developments would only serve to line the pockets of the landowners and the developers whilst degrading the quality of the environment and changing the community identity. This is not the purpose of the Core Strategy.

### **Justified**

I cannot find evidence to show that all available brown field and non-Green Belt sites have been thoroughly exhausted. Also I cannot find evidence that collaboration has been sought with Bradford. The use of Green Belt land should only be considered as a last resort and without proof that a comprehensive review has been made and that all the alternatives have been exhausted. I do not consider the proposed developments HG2-10, HG2-12, HG2-41, HG2-42, HG2-43 to be justified.

In addition to HG2-10, HG2-12, HG2-41, HG2-42, HG2-43, the developments HG3-2, HG3-3 & HG3-4 would destroy pieces of countryside forever, along with the habitat of the wildlife living there. Has there been a survey to determine whether the sites contain protected species such as newts and bats?

Also these developments would diminish the outdoor activities that take place in these areas, such as walking, horse riding, cycling, bird and wildlife watching.

The present look of the valley will be changed and in my opinion will be spoiled.

Furthermore, the current use and potential use of this land for farming would be lost forever. As well as the obvious loss of contribution to agriculture, this in effect would be denying the opportunity for local business.

From personal experience the A65 route into Leeds and the ring road already suffer heavy congestion. The impact of the proposed developments would create havoc and misery for those who use these routes and those living nearby. The inclusion of a school in HG2-41 would attract extra traffic close to the busy junction of these two routes.

### **Effective**

Access to the main A65 road for developments HG2-12, HG3-2, HG3-3 and HG3-4 will be insufficient for the proposed residents.

In general, the loss of natural soak-up will lead to potential flooding, either directly from run-off or indirectly due to overload of drainage systems.

The combined quantity of houses to be built in the proposed developments HG2-10, HG2-12, HG2-41, HG2-42, HG2-43, HG3-2, HG3-3 & HG3-4 will mean that there will be a significant increase in local population. This will place pressure on the existing amenities such as schools, surgeries, dentists, care centres, recreational facilities and parks. Will the emergency services be able to cope with the increase in population the development will produce? Whilst HG2-41 includes provision for a school, it would be naive to believe that this would cater for all ages and abilities.

### **Consistency with National Policy**

As I have already stated the Core Strategy has omitted the last part of the NPPF requirements for Green Belt which reads "to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land". It would appear that developments HG2-10, HG2-12, HG2-41, HG2-42, HG2-43 have been proposed without thorough alternative consideration of recycling of derelict and other urban land and are therefore not consistent with National Policy.

The combined effects of the proposed developments HG2-12, HG2-41, HG2-42, HG2-43, HG3-2, HG3-3 & HG3-4 will act to merge Rawdon with Horsforth which is not consistent with National Policy.

The rural nature of the environments and the views from the ring road and A65 will be spoiled by the proposed developments HG2-10, HG2-12, HG2-41, HG2-42, HG2-43, HG3-2, HG3-3 & HG3-4 which is not consistent with National Policy.

### **Legally Compliant**

I do not believe that I have been properly consulted about the general proposal to change the Green Belt boundaries or the safe guarded land allocations. I have only been made aware of these through the Rawdon Greenbelt Action Group.

Regards,

Mrs. B Kinghorn,

No. 1 Cottage, Fulford Grange, Micklefield Lane, Rawdon, Leeds, LS19 6BA.