

From:
To: [Site Allocations Plan](#)
Cc: stuart.andrew.mp@parliamnet.uk;
Subject: PDE02104_Planning on Sites HG2-41, HG2-12, HG3-2 and HG3-3
Date: 11 November 2015 13:31:15

Dear Sirs

Dear Sir/Madam

As planners

I am writing to object to the proposed site allocation plans for the development on Green Belt land in the Rawdon/Horsforth area.

As Planners, the decisions you make now affect the future of our city, for this generation and the next. Legislation and guidelines are in force to protect green belt land, communities and character... for a reason. The Green belt guidelines have recently been strengthened. The objections stated here point clearly to the fact that Government guidelines, legislation and the planning framework are being ignored.

Taking into account all the points below, please also take into account your responsibility as planners. To protect the environment, the richness of nature of the suburbs of Leeds, the greenery and open space for future generations. Misplaced short term target needs, short term decisions have a permanent effect on the land, you cannot reverse mistaken decisions.

The proposed use of sites HG2-41, HG2-12, HG3-2 and HG3-3 would serve to merge Horsforth and Rawdon. **This is inconsistent with both the National Planning Policy Framework and Leeds Core Strategy.**

I refer to the National Planning Policy Framework, section 9 "Protecting Green Belt Land" and the following paragraphs:

"79: The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence."

The plan to use large sections of local Green Belt is inconsistent with this paragraph.

"80: Green Belt serves Five purposes:

- to check the unrestricted urban sprawl of large built-up areas;*
- to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;*
- to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;*
- to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns;*
- to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land."*

The plan to use local Green Belt ignores several of the above purposes and is therefore inconsistent with national policy. The plan to build on sites HG2-12 and HG2-41 will effectively merge Rawdon with Horsforth.

Chapter 11 of the sustainable development section of the NPPF states:

"109: The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

- Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes..*
- Recognising the wider benefits of ecosystem services*
- Minimising impacts on biodiversity"*

The use of several of the proposed sites is inconsistent with this aspect of national policy.

Leeds Core Strategy defines Green Belt as:

"A designation for areas of open land around certain cities and large built up areas where the strict planning controls apply to keep this land permanently open or largely undeveloped."

Section 1.8 of the core strategy states:

"Key priorities therefore include: planning for the provision of home and jobs in sustainable locations, respecting local character and distinctiveness in the delivery of the Plan's objectives and maximising opportunities to recycle previously developed land (PDL) whilst minimising greenfield and Green Belt release, in planning for longer term growth."

Page 60 of the Leeds Core Strategy, paragraph 4.11 contains a map which shows that many of the sites proposed for housing allocation are in Green Belt.

Page 78 of the Leeds Core Strategy titled "Key Diagram" is a map identifying 'Strategic Green Infrastructure' many of the proposed sites conflict with this.

Therefore, not only is the site allocation inconsistent with national policy, it is also inconsistent with Leeds' own established policy.

In conclusion, the plans are not consistent with the local development plan or government guidelines. The effect on the character of the suburbs, the loss of green fields, the effect on nature, natural habitats, vistas, will be flawed. Your decision is permanent and as has been historically proven, the thin end of the wedge, setting a precedent for future planning till all the green belt is lost. This is the reason that legislation and guidelines exist. It is your responsibility as planners to work within the guidelines set, but it is a greater responsibility than that.

Yours faithfully

Nick Hockney