

From:
To: [Site Allocations Plan](#)
Subject: PDE02246_Site ref HGX-XX Letter of objection to proposed planning
Date: 29 October 2015 15:54:31

11 Snaithwood Drive

Rawdon

Leeds

LS19 6SZ

30th October 2015

Dear Sir/Madam

Site Ref HGX-XX

I am writing to express my concerns about the proposed planning in and around the area of Rawdon

I appose the planning on several different levels:

I have lived in the area for 15 years now and throughout that time have experienced an unprecedented increase in congestion around the A65 and Horsforth. I see no way of improving the infrastructure of the already hugely congested roads to allow them to cope with any more housing. Our roads are already stretched to the absolute limit.

Where we live (on Woodlands Drive) we already face a battle with the use of our road (privately maintained by residents) as a cut through to avoid traffic. We often have to queue to enter the A65 from Knott Lane as a consequence of funeral traffic and once on the A65 are frequently met with stationary traffic. How on earth will 'Roads' deal with this when the planned 100's of houses on the sites around us are built?

I am a governor at Horsforth St Margaret's C of E School and as long I have been associated with that school it has been hugely oversubscribed and we have not been able to offer all those with a first preference a place. I sit on the Horsforth Schools Cluster committee and it is the same in every school and ALL the head

teachers are worried about how we are going to find places for all these children who will come in to the area with these new houses. One new Primary school as is proposed on the Strawberry Fields site will NOT solve this problem.

Linked to this is the Governments argument that 'we need more affordable housing'. This housing will not be affordable! Houses built by developers in one of the most sought after areas in West Yorkshire to live in will not be made affordable. Like every other house in Horsforth and the surrounding area these will carry a premium price tag. The greed of the developers will ensure this.

Why, if we need housing so badly can we not just build affordable housing on the huge swaths of brown field site in other parts of Leeds? The reason, these are not considered desirable places to live and will not command premium, profit making prices. We do not need any more houses in this area. The housing is needed else where in Leeds, so why don't you build it where it is needed, on brown field sites and in areas where urban regeneration would be beneficial through the recycling of derelict and other urban land? This will ultimately provide those families from less affluent areas of Leeds with the brand new affordable housing that other areas in Leeds are crying out for and be consistent with national policy.

My next point is the wildlife and natural beauty of the area. I frequently see a herd of deer on one of your proposed development sites. We have an abundance of rare breeds (hedgehogs are becoming more and more threatened), hedgerows in which these animals live and breed, trees that will need to be felled in order to build. The infrastructure that will spring up around the major roads that you will need to build to ease congestion will make the loss of these habitats move devastating to the wildlife. All of this will simply decimate the wildlife. Last year 2 of our deer were killed on the A65 and the Rodley by pass. It was sickening to see, they are being driven out of their natural habitat by development. Where will it stop?

The NPPF states that any planning should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes and recognizing the wider benefits of ecosystems services as well as minimizing impacts on biodiversity. The use of several of the proposed sites in Rawdon is wholly inconsistent with this aspect of national policy.

Based on the Leeds and National Core Strategy which states that the key priorities should include respecting local character and distinctiveness in delivery of the plans objectives and maximising opportunities to **recycle** previously developed land (PDL) whilst minimizing green field and Green Belt release I believe that not only is the site allocation in Rawdon inconsistent with National policy, it is also inconsistent with Leeds' own established policy.

Also if the government attaches such importance to Green Belt policy in order to prevent urban sprawl and the fact that the characteristics of Green Belt are their openness and their permanence then the use of such large areas of local Green Belt in this area is inconsistent with this governments' own policy.

Urban sprawl will ultimately result in the merging of adjacent towns, a loss of safeguarded countryside and a loss of the setting and special character of the

village of Rawdon. The building on these Green belt sites ignores the purposes of Green Belt areas and therefore is inconsistent with national policy

In its preparation of the site allocation proposal Leeds has completely ignored the most fundamental purpose of Green Belt, to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land thereby making the whole process inconsistent with the National Planning Policy Framework.

At the risk of repeating myself so often in the NPPF is it stated that development should minimize Greenfield and Green Belt release and maximize opportunities to recycle previously developed land (PDL). I see very few sites (if any) in Rawdon where the slightest bit of attention has been paid to this and therefore the site allocation in this area is inconsistent with national policy and with Leeds' own established policy.

My children need a legacy. They need to know that some part of what they grew up with has been protected. I don't want then to see their beloved 'Strawberry Fields' built on. I want then to be safe crossing roads rather than having a vastly increased volume of traffic to contend with, I'd like their children to have access to the education that they never did (we have been forced to now pay for both the children's education due to lack of suitable secondary school places)

The whole situation is utterly desperate, and fuelled by profit and financial gain for a few rather than for the benefit of the majority. It is also so obviously in breach of the National Planning Policy Framework and also Local and National Government policy.

Can you please tell me when we are going to be given a proper forum in which to share our views and speak directly to the person who is making these decisions? Open consultations are wholly inadequate.

Thank you for your time

Yours Faithfully

Lorna Swarbrigg