

**From:** .  
**To:** [Site Allocations Plan](#)  
**Cc:** [stuart.AndrewMP@parliament.uk](mailto:stuart.AndrewMP@parliament.uk)  
**Subject:** PDE01616\_Site Allocations Plan comments in relation to sites HG3-2, HG3-3, HG3-4, HG2-12, HG2-41  
**Date:** 14 November 2015 15:25:23

---

To whom it may concern,

Further to your invitation to comment upon the above proposed sites, I would like to object to the proposed use what is currently green belt land for proposed housing and the removal of greenbelt land to safeguarded land for the remaining sites listed above.

I firstly wish to give some background to this. Having grown up in rural North Yorkshire and moved to Leeds for work purposes, I chose to settle in Rawdon. I chose Rawdon, specifically because it was a village in it's own right surrounded by greenbelt land and with it's own community and access to greenspace for my family to enjoy, as opposed to living in suburban sprawl.

I feel that it is important to state that the development and use of these greenbelt sites is not justified on a large number of grounds. Currently Rawdon and Horsforth are two distinct villages, which are divided by the Ghyll Beck. The proposals to see HG3-4 and HG3-3 eventually be built upon would take building right up to the boundary into the Horsforth ward, and coupled with proposed building of HG2-41 the built up areas would only be separated by the crematorium, although I do acknowledge that as a site Hg2-41, with large scale building on the former clarinet site and further building on HG1-96, is now less greenbelt and more of an individual green belt field.

In relation to this the core strategy requires a comprehensive greenbelt review which as far as I am aware has not been undertaken.

Many areas of Rawdon currently enjoy beautiful and distinct rural open views, which would be altered forever, should all of the proposed building be undertaken. HG3-4, HG3-3 would have the greatest personal impact for me personally, but much of Rawdon would be greatly impacted by HG2-12 and HG3-2 as well. In reality what is currently a semi- rural landscape would simply turn into suburban ugly sprawl.

These areas of greenbelt are by their very nature valuable wildlife habitats, living close to HG3-4 we regularly see wildlife in the fields especially deer, bats and birds of prey, but I am also aware this site, along with HG2-12 and HG3-3 are classified as UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) priority habitats because they host wild deer, bats, fields are, Lapwings, curlew, sparrow Hawks and Tawny owls. All of these habitats would be lost.

The beautiful and ancient Ghyll (red) beck runs next to HG3-4, HG2-41 and and HG3-3. All of the sites mentioned above contain protected trees and woodland areas, which we regularly enjoy walking through as a family and and watch many ramblers, dog walkers and families enjoy on a daily basis.

The A65 is currently working over capacity, with many commuters experiencing long delays on their way to work. The effects of the clarinet site and the new system on Horsforth roundabout are really being felt both on the A65, but also in the Town St part of Rawdon which is now a really bad rat run. HG2-12, HG3-2, HG3-3, HG3-4, HG2 -41 as well as the other proposed sires in Aireborough and Horsforth (totalling almost 4500 houses so at least 6000 more cars) will bring the A65 and the smaller roads through the towns and villages to a standstill. This is also likely to have a significant impact on the air quality and therefore potential health effects on local residents.

Site HG3-3 is located within the Cragg Wood Conservation Area and HG2-12 is within sight of the area, which would almost defeat the objectives of the conservation area and the conservation area would effectively be lost.

Aireborough is directly adjacent to Bradford council and when considering housing provision and need, it would surely have made sense to work with Bradford to ensure that brown field and then if absolutely necessary appropriate green field sites would be sufficient to meet the Housing needs of both cities. The original estimate of the number of new properties needed for Leeds based on data from the Office of National Statistics was 70,000, and yet this targets has remained at 70,000 ,

despite revised projections by the ONS now estimating 45000 would be needed. The core strategy has been incorrectly based on the 70,000. If Leeds City Council had made a reduction in the target of just 15,000 properties there wouldn't have been any need to take any areas out of greenbelt at all.

There are a number of large brown field sites across Leeds and these should be developed before any areas of greenbelt land should even be considered. The associated costs of building on brownfield sites and likely desirable location of green belt sites (resulting in higher house prices and greater profits) in particular means that where green field and green belt sites are allocated for housing alongside brownfield sites, the green field or belts sites will be built upon first.

The National Planning Policy framework, especially chapters 9, 11 and 12 require that greenbelt should only built upon in exceptional circumstances and covers the protection of green belt, conserving the natural environment and conserving the historic environment and the points that I have already made above illustrate that these factors have not been complied with. Leeds City Council state that growth is the exceptional circumstance, however, this is contrary to what has been indicated by government ministers and exceptional circumstances certainly cannot be cited in instances where green belt sites are allocated for housing alongside brownfield (and therefore resulting in most likely being developed alongside or before the brownfield).

I would also like to comment that site HG2-12 appears to have sneaked in as an allocated for Housing without being included in the previous issues and options consultations and has therefore not been open to public consultation previously.

There are also some practical reasons that may make some of the developments ineffective. The surface water drainage to sites HG3-4 is regularly water logged in winter and surface flooding on HG2-12 may make the site undeliverable.

The highways access site is limited and inadequate to site HG3-4 with access only from either Layton Lane or Layton Road, all with limited visibility. HG2-12, HG3-2 and HG3-3 would together need alterations and upgrades to Knott Lane, but would remain inadequate to serve that number of houses adequately. Interestingly the highways access to HG2-12 is reliant on highways upgrades on development of the other 2 sites that are safeguarded, whereas this sites is allocated, yet in theory the upgrades would not be in place at that time. Vehicles using the crematorium also result in significant extra traffic using this very small road.

I would ask that you carefully consider the comments that we have made as it really would be incredibly detrimental to the amenity of all local residents and visitors to Leeds if these greenbelt sites were to be lost and turned into housing.

Yours sincerely

Mrs Alison Gilliland  
4 Ghyll Beck Drive  
Rawdon

Sent from my iPad