

From: [Jason Andrews](#)
To: [Site Allocations Plan](#)
Subject: PDE03081_Objection to planning on sites EG1-5, HG3-2, HG3-3, HG2-12, HG2-41, HG2-42 and HG2-43
Date: 16 November 2015 12:51:11

I am writing to strongly oppose the planning on sites HG2 41, HG2-42 HG2 43 in Horsforth / Rawdon

These areas are VAST & unneeded, they don't offer "affordable housing" to local young people, they offer more houses of 3 bed upwards offered for sale at prices of £300k+ which are well beyond the average persons reach.

Not consistent with the NPPF

The NPPF states that Green Belt should check unrestricted urban sprawl and to prevent adjacent settlements from merging. Site HG2-12 and the neighbouring HG3-2/3/4 sites all sit on the border of Rawdon and Horsforth, and together with the [proposed](#) huge development on the Horsforth side (HG2-41, 42, 43) this would mean a merging of Rawdon and Horsforth and therefore again not consistent with National Policy.

In addition the NPPF promotes the use of brownfield ..."by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land" for development rather than using the Green Belt. Brownfield sites ARE available across Leeds, & these should be used for housing before looking at other sites – even if the ones around Horsforth & Rawdon are more profitable to the developers, the principle to allow Green Belt before brownfield in Leeds [cannot be](#) justified and again [is](#) not in accordance with the NPPF.

Traffic Congestion

HG2 41, HG2-42 HG2 43 sites all border the A65 & will specifically add increased traffic to the Horsforth main roundabout.

Despite the recent works this roundabout is overloaded, cannot cope with current traffic levels & has queueing traffic from all directions at almost all times of the day. How does the council propose to deal with this additional traffic? The roundabout cannot cope – the whole area will be gridlocked.

What research has LCC carried out to find out what the effect of development of sites EG1-5, HG3-2, HG3-3, HG2-12, HG2-41, HG2-42 and HG2-43 will have on traffic flow, and with what result?

The development of the Clariol site is opposite these sites & was, I understand, allowed on appeal despite objections from LCC that the transport infrastructure could not cope with the extra demands placed upon it. - LCC were right in saying that the transport infrastructure could not cope, it does not cope, so why put more development there? It makes no sense.

Impact on local residents well being & local wildlife

The Leeds Country Way and a labyrinth of other footpaths and walks lattice their way across, around and alongside the sites HG2-12, HG3-2 and HG3-3. These ancient footpaths are key recreational routes for walkers, cyclists and horses as well as deer, foxes and other wild animals.

Sites EG1-5, HG3-2, HG3-3, HG2-12, HG2-41, HG2-42 and HG2-43 are part of

the vital greenbelt corridor separating Leeds from Bradford. The Leeds/Bradford boundary lies within half a mile or so to the west of the Cragg Wood conservation area. They are also within or adjacent to the green corridor and walking access routes to the canal and riverside walks stretching from Apperley Bridge to the centre of Leeds. It is of fundamental importance to the residents of neighbouring suburbs that they can take country air and exercise close to and within walking distance of their own homes and without having to drive into the moors and dales many miles to the west. Walking beside a housing estate is not the same as walking beside greenbelt. The amenity value of walks along the river and canal banks between Rodley and Apperley Bridge is very high indeed.

The Strategic Green Infrastructure of Aire Valley will be forever lost restricting enjoyment of these areas for walking, cycling, horse-riding and harming nature and ecology. The Leeds Country Way runs through [HG2-12](#) and alongside [HG3-2](#) and [HG3-3](#), a key regional recreational route. All sites are part of LCC's own designated Strategic Green Infrastructure Area.

I am told, but not by LCC, that [HG2-12](#), [HG3-3](#) and [HG3-4](#) are UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) Priority Habitats, hosting wild deer, bats, fieldfare, lapwing, curlew, sparrow hawk, tawny owl. Ancient Ghyll Beck runs next to [HG3-4](#) Layton Lane fields and through [HG3-3](#) and [HG2-41](#). All sites contain protected mature trees and woodland. [HG3-3](#) has a native bluebell wood. [HG3-2](#) is adjacent to UK BAP Priority Habitat pond with palmate newts, also found in [HG2-12](#).

From using the footpaths regularly around the area I know there are many deer and other animals that roam freely over all the sites now proposed for development. I do not know whether they and other wild life will be able to survive during and after heavily concentrated construction work.

I wish to see documents showing what consultations LCC has made with expert wildlife bodies and individuals before and during making its decisions on Sites EG1-5, HG3-2, HG3-3, HG2-12, HG2-41, HG2-42 and HG2-43, and with what results.

Housing Target out of date

We are told that 70,000 new homes are needed but that this figure might not be accurate and might be closer to 45,000. So why has this not been revised? Both are large numbers but the difference is significant. Given the scale of the exercise and the difficulties in providing infrastructure that will follow from either number, surely using the lower number is better?

I do think that the council need to do a lot more consultation with local residents of Horsforth & Rawdon where we already feel "over subscribed". There are other areas in Leeds which are less popular to developers (due to price no doubt) but offer much more suitable transport links & would be ripe for redevelopment, new development & regeneration in those areas would make more sense, areas like Kippax, Castleford, Aberford, Church Fenton & Micklefield for instance.

Thank you

Jason Andrews