

From: .
To: [Site Allocations Plan](#)
Subject: PDE01967_Leeds Council Public Consultation on Leeds Site Allocation - Rawdon Objection
Date: 12 November 2015 17:01:38

Leeds Council Public Consultation on Leeds Site Allocation - Rawdon Objection

To whom it may concern:

I am writing to express my objections to the proposed site allocations as detailed below.

HG3-4, HG3-2, HG3-3, HG2-12, HG2-41 and HG2-10

My details are:

Name: Elizabeth Marsden

Address: 26 Layton Park Croft, Rawdon LS19 6PN

My objections to **HG3-4** are as follows:

Development not justified

- Loss of Greenbelt. I consciously chose to live in Rawdon, not Horsforth. The proposed development at HG3-4 would see the 2 merge. It would also remove, permanently, vital greenbelt land. There has been NO comprehensive greenbelt review for this, as required in the Core Strategy.
- Removal of wildlife habitat. HG3-4 is a UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) Priority Habitats, hosting wild deer, bats, fieldfare, lapwing, curlew, sparrow hawk, tawny owl.
- Impact on the A65 – I have spent a year travelling this road dealing with the chaos caused during the Horsforth and Rodley roundabout developments. These have now finished and I can see absolutely no improvement to the A65 traffic congestion at peak times. In fact I would contend that it is worse – taking at least 30 minutes from Layton Lane to the roundabout at 4.30pm most days. The A65 simply cannot cope with any increase in traffic. Concentrating more developments along it is unsustainable, dangerous and would be a disaster for the area.
- Failure to revise housing target. I would also like it to be acknowledged that Council has not revised its housing target in response to revised ONS projections which would mean city needs 45,000 and not current target of 70,000 - on which Council based its Core Strategy. A reduction in target of just 15,000 would remove the need to take any land out of greenbelt.
- Brownfield sites ARE available elsewhere across Leeds. **LCC Core Strategy** states that all these must be developed before greenbelt land.

Development not legally compliant:

- I was unaware of this current public consultation until I read information from the Rawdon Greenbelt Action Group

Development NOT positively prepared:

- This Site Allocations Plan is not based on a comprehensive Greenbelt review as required by the previous Inspector when he passed the 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.
- I was unaware of proposals until campaigning information was received.
- Development NOT in accordance with the NPPF:
- Especially chapters 9 Protecting Greenbelt, 11 Conserving Natural Environment and 12 Conserving Historic Environment. By not considering alternatives (such as available brownfield sites), the Council has not proved that 'exceptional circumstances' exist to outweigh the harm that development would cause to the greenbelt sites here.

My objections to **HG3-2** are as follows:

Development not justified:

- Vital areas of Leeds greenbelt would be lost forever if these plans went ahead. The boundaries between Leeds and Bradford and Rawdon loses its village identity.
- Wildlife habitats lost – The HG3-2 site is adjacent to UK BAP Priority Habitat pond with palmate newts.
- Grade 3 farmland lost – HG3-2 is regularly farmed currently.
- Brownfield sites ARE available elsewhere across Leeds. LCC Core Strategy states itself that all these must be developed before greenbelt land.
- Development NOT positively prepared:
- This Site Allocations Plan is not based on a comprehensive Greenbelt review as required by the previous Inspector when he passed the 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.
- I was unaware of proposals until campaigning information was received.

Development not legally compliant:

- I was unaware of this current public consultation until I read information from the Rawdon Greenbelt Action Group

Development NOT in accordance with the NPPF:

- Especially chapters 9 Protecting Greenbelt, 11 Conserving Natural Environment and 12 Conserving Historic Environment. By not considering alternatives (such as available brownfield sites), the Council has not proved that 'exceptional circumstances' exist to outweigh the harm that development would cause to the greenbelt sites here.

My objections to **HG3-3** are as follows:

Development not justified:

- Loss of Greenbelt. Leeds Country Way, a key regional recreational route, runs alongside HG3-3. Losing this would be a terrible loss to Leeds, restricting enjoyment of the area for walking, cycling, and all other forms of outdoor activity. How can Leeds campaign for greater fitness for our citizens, and showcase our participation in events such as the Tour de Yorkshire, whilst removing the very thing that attracts people to our countryside?
- Rawdon Cragg Wood conservation are LOST if these plans go ahead. Its setting and views, as enshrined in Cragg Wood Conservation Area Appraisal would be ruined by the current proposals and the HG3-3 site is directly WITHIN that conservation area.
- Impact on the A65 – I have spent a year travelling this road dealing with the chaos caused during the Horsforth and Rodley roundabout developments. These have now finished and I can see absolutely no improvement to the A65 traffic congestion at peak times. In fact I would contend that it is worse – taking at least 30 minutes from Layton Lane to the roundabout at 4.30pm most days. The A65 simply cannot cope with any increase in traffic. Concentrating more developments along it is unsustainable, dangerous and would be a disaster for the area.
- Failure to revise housing target. I would also like it to be acknowledged that Council has not revised its housing target in response to revised ONS projections which would mean city needs 45,000 and not current target of 70,000 - on which Council based its Core Strategy. A reduction in target of just 15,000 would remove need to take any land out of greenbelt.
- Brownfield sites ARE available elsewhere across Leeds. **LCC Core Strategy** states that all these must be developed before greenbelt land.
- Development not effective:
- Highways access. Collectively HG3-12, HG3-2 and HG3-3 would require realignment of Knott Lane, but would be insufficient to serve the amount of traffic. As already stated, I believe the A65 is already struggling to cope with the volume of traffic, increased housing would lead to an unacceptable situation.

Development NOT positively prepared:

- This Site Allocations Plan is not based on a comprehensive Greenbelt review as required by the previous Inspector when he passed the 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.
- I was unaware of proposals until campaigning information was received.

Development not legally compliant:

- I was unaware of this current public consultation until I read information from the Rawdon Greenbelt Action Group

Development NOT in accordance with the NPPF:

- Especially chapters 9 Protecting Greenbelt, 11 Conserving Natural Environment and 12 Conserving Historic Environment. By not considering alternatives (such as the available brownfield sites), the Council has not proved that 'exceptional circumstances' exist to outweigh the harm that development would cause to the greenbelt sites here.

My objections to **HG2-12** are as follows:

Development not justified:

- Special landscape Area lost forever. The distinctive open valley views and rural character of Rawdon village and Leeds/Bradford green corridor would be lost if these plans go ahead.
- Rawdon Cragg Wood conservation is LOST if these plans go ahead. Its setting and views, as enshrined in Cragg Wood Conservation Area Appraisal, would be ruined by the current proposals and the HG2-12 is within the immediate setting of conservation area.
- Impact on the A65 – I have spent a year travelling this road dealing with the chaos caused during the Horsforth and Rodley roundabout developments. These have now finished and I can see absolutely no improvement to the A65 traffic congestion at peak times. In fact I would contend that it is worse – taking at least 30 minutes from Layton Lane to the roundabout at 4.30pm most days. The A65 simply cannot cope with any increase in traffic. Concentrating more developments along it is unsustainable, dangerous and would be a disaster for the area.

Development not effective:

- Highways access. There is only one access point onto site via Southlands Avenue, as other roads are private. This is inadequate for 130 houses. Knott Lane is barely suitable for additional development, and is also used for frequent Crematorium traffic. See also my previous points about A65 congestion.
- Significant surface water flooding in HG2-12 may make site undeliverable.
- 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.
- Development NOT legally compliant:
- There was NO consultation on this site prior to it being allocated to housing in the Site Allocations Plan.
- It was also NOT included in the Issues and Options consultation in June
- I was unaware of this current public consultation until I read information from the Rawdon Greenbelt Action Group

Development NOT positively prepared:

- This Site Allocations Plan is not based on a comprehensive Greenbelt review as required by the previous Inspector when he passed the 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.
- I was unaware of proposals until campaigning information was received.

Development NOT in accordance with the NPPF:

- Especially chapters 9 Protecting Greenbelt, 11 Conserving Natural Environment and 12 Conserving Historic Environment. By not considering alternatives the Council has not proved that 'exceptional circumstances' exist to outweigh the harm that development would cause to the greenbelt sites here.

My objections to **HG2-41** are as follows:

Development not justified:

- Special landscape Area lost forever. The distinctive open valley views and rural character of Rawdon village and Leeds/Bradford green corridor would be lost if these plans go ahead.
- A65 Full and overcapacity already. See my previous points. Another 771 households with create gridlock
- Wildlife habitats lost. Ancient Ghyll Beck runs through HG2-41. This site contains protected mature trees ad woodland.
- Grade 3 farmland lost. Land within HG241 is regularly farmed

Development NOT positively prepared:

- This Site Allocations Plan is not based on a comprehensive Greenbelt review as required by the previous Inspector when he passed the 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.
- I was unaware of proposals until campaigning information was received

Development NOT in accordance with the NPPF:

- Especially chapters 9 Protecting Greenbelt, 11 Conserving Natural Environment and 12 Conserving Historic Environment. By not considering alternatives, the Council has not proved that 'exceptional circumstances' exist to outweigh the harm that development would cause to the greenbelt sites here.

My objections to site **HG2-10** are as follows:

Development not justified:

- Special landscape area lost forever. This area has recently been categorised as a Conservation Area – how can building 110 houses maintain this? Housing density and removal of all agricultural land is contrary to Conservation Area status.
- Loss of Greenbelt
- Potential merging of adjacent towns
- Transport/network access. Access from this site onto A65 will increase congestion and will prove problematic. Other access to site proposed on Gill Lane would take traffic onto a single lane into the heart of the Conservation Area
- Educational provision.
- Local primary schools (Rawdon Littlemoor and Westfield Primary) are currently oversubscribed. Additional housing can only exacerbate this.

Yours faithfully,

Elizabeth Marsden