

**From:** [Kathryn Grant](#)  
**To:** [Site Allocations Plan](#)  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** PDE02805\_Objection to HG2-12  
**Date:** 16 November 2015 15:26:15

---

Dear Site Allocations Team,

I only realised major development was planned on my road, Woodlands Drive, and around Knott Lane and the A65, five weeks ago because of the actions of Rawdon Greenbelt Action Group and Briony Spandler in raising awareness of the site allocations and the 'so-called' consultation.

I subsequently became involved in the campaign because I was so incredulous and outraged that development could be considered on HG2-12, with a mere 6 weeks of inadequate consultation. Only then did I find out about HG2-41 (the huge Green Belt site which is going to be released) and the 'safeguarded' sites which are not actually safeguarded beyond 2028, but are proposed to meet a contingency for shortfall within the plan period, in defiance of national policy (see how Council has drafted the Core Strategy and the SAP at section 4). I doubt many people who take the word safeguarded as read are aware of this fact. Neither of the allocated sites (HG2-12 and HG2-41) has been subject to consultation prior to this 6 week consultation, which is so poor as to be almost laughable. If it was not for the actions of action groups like RGAG, nobody in the community, including me, would know anything about them.

I wrote the chapters on Green Belt, Conservation and Heritage, Landscape and Character, Green Infrastructure Area and parts of Consultation and Not Effective in the RGAG report, and the Executive Summary - please refer to separately. I stand by every word of these submissions which have been painstakingly researched and drafted alongside Briony over the last 5 weeks. I am happy to give evidence to the public enquiry in support of them. I do not propose to repeat these arguments in detail here but I would like to give a personal view of HG2-12.

This field is in a special area. It is 'not just' Green Belt! The fields around it are totally unspoilt and undeveloped, providing a refuge, an oasis in the city. It is in the immediate and adjacent setting of the historically unique unspoilt Cragg Wood Conservation Area, the openness of which it is essential to conserve and which is explicitly protected by the Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan. It is part of the beautiful, scenic Aire valley green corridor between Leeds and Bradford which it is strategically essential to maintain, especially given the huge development pressures in this area. It is a Strategic Green Infrastructure Area enjoyed by hundreds of thousands of people from the greater urban population it serves in Leeds and Bradford. It is vital to people's recreation and health and well-being. It is on the direct route of Leeds' only two country parks and city-wide trail, the Leeds Country Way. This area strategically defines not just the village of Rawdon, but the city and the region. It has national importance, as the NCA appraisals (38) make clear. It is a Special Landscape Area which is designated for a management strategy of conservation and enhancement (through the Landscape Character Review 2011). Development would be totally out of scale and relationship to the village form, separating it from the village and causing an isolated, badly connected extension. Need I go on...?

Development would destroy this area and the enjoyment of so many people, who value it for its openness, its greenness, a slice of

unspoilt countryside on their doorstep. There is outrage in the community about it. That the planners in their wisdom decided to include this field for 130 houses at the 11th hour is almost laughable. 'Almost' laughable because we have had to drop everything - young families, work, friends...to fight this.

Is this REALLY the only place to cram in 130 houses? If that is the case, the housing targets in the Core Strategy are seriously unsustainable, and the harm caused would manifestly outweigh the 'benefits' of housing supply. The fact that this site has been put in, after the Issues and Options consultation, which supposedly had a surplus of sites to choose from, and the fact that it is so manifestly unsuitable (it is actually UNDELIVERABLE in the plan period) shows a serious failure in planning by Leeds City Council.

It is often argued, but rarely true, but this really is a unique area. It is valuable. It is precious. It cannot be allowed to be thrown under the wheels of a developer-led strategy which has apparently allowed housing 'viability' to run rough-shod over every other consideration in the NPPF.

Apparently, Barrett Homes are interested in developing Woodlands Drive. I wonder why. Houses here, with this view, could fetch £700,000 each. Clearly the kind of housing that will be built will not be 'affordable' by the local people and it will not (hopefully) achieve anywhere like the kind of scale and density 'needed' by the Council to fulfill its targets. A Barrett Homes style estate is not what this precious area needs thank you very much.

This is not nimbyism. I don't live anywhere near this field, but I pass it every day on the way to the city. It is precious. I see runners, cyclists, walkers with their children coming out from the city to enjoy this area every hour of the day and I am proud of it. For the sake of a few houses, do not let it be lost.

There are alternatives. Many of them. Neighbourhood plans are in development in Aireborough, Rawdon and Horsforth. We are willing to work positively and constructively with the Council to identify other more appropriate housing options.

For these reasons you must find this allocation unsound.

Yours sincerely,  
Kathryn Grant  
Cragg Mount, Woodlands Drive, Rawdon, Leeds, LS19 6JZ