

From: [zoe beeforth](#)
To: [Site Allocations Plan](#)
Subject: PDE02694_Re: Objection for sites HG2-12 HG2-41 HG3-2 HG3-3 HG3-4
Date: 16 November 2015 16:06:58

Please add my address to my email below:
28 Layton Lane,
Rawdon,
Leeds
Ls196rg

G3-3 HG3-4

To whom it may concern,

I live in Rawdon with my husband and 2 children we are very lucky to live in an area with lots of green spaces and farmland around us. We selected our house as it was positioned within the green spaces. We regularly enjoy our surrounding areas we walk to school and explore all of our green belt area. I believe the proposed developments on the following sites reference HG2-12, HG2-41, HG3-2, HG3-3, HG3-4

Are NOT justified for the following reasons:

Our special landscape area would be LOST forever the visual impact of proposed development would spoil the current valley views.

Rawdon Cragg Wood conservation area would be LOST as proposed site HG3-3 is within the conservation area.

The vital areas of green belt would be LOST forever as as a result the wildlife habitats would be DESTROYED. Priority habitats including wild deer, bats, field fare, lapwing, curlew, sparrow hawk, tawny owl would disappear. All sites contain protected mature trees and woodland. one site has a native bluebell wood another an established pond with palmate newts.

Grade 3 farmland would be LOST the rich agricultural land would disappear resulting in loss of jobs and framing heritage and LOSS of bee keeping apiary.

The A65 is FULL to capacity currently the increase of population would impact hugely on the current congestion. This busy road would NOT cope with any additional traffic.

Not enough school places ALL local schools are heavily over subscribed already.

Brownfield sites are available elsewhere across Leeds (25000) with planning permission as per Leeds city council core strategy. It states that all brownfield sites must be developed before any green belt land. In response to revised ONS projections which would mean that Leeds city council would need 45000 houses and NOT 70000 on which the council based its core strategy.

There is also a large amount of privately owned houses that have been empty for a number of years that the council could enforce the landlords to make habitable.

I believe the development is NOT effective for the following reasons:

Phasing of HG2-12 undeliverable as this has been incorrectly categorised as allocated and can NOT be delivered.

Highways assess limited HG2-12 only one access point and regular crematorium traffic would effect ALL 3 sites close by. HG2-12 HG3-2 HG3-3 would make access issues onto the A65 potentially impossible to pull out.

HG2-12 significant water flooding would make site undeliverable

I believe the development is NOT legally compliant for the following reasons:

No consultation on site HD2-12 prior to allocation.

HG2-12 NOT included in issues and options consultation in June.

NOT compliant with statement of community involvement.

I had NO correspondence about the councils public consultation in 2013.

Development NOT positively prepared.

There was NO comprehensive green belt review as required by previous inspector when he passed core strategy as sound.

Selective and FLAWED green belt review means the core strategy and site allocation plan are UNSOUND.

Development NOT in accordance with the NPPF.

Especially chapters 9 protecting green belt 11 conserving natural environment 12 conserving historic environment.

It is vital that all my points are taken into consideration as safeguarding our local green spaces is important to myself, my family and my local community.

Yours sincerely
Zoe Beeforth.