

From: [Sophie Sheard](#)
To: [Site Allocations Plan](#)
Subject: PDE03157_LEEDS SITE ALLOCATIONS PLAN - SITE REFERENCES: HG2-12, HG2-41, HG3-2, HG3-3 & HG3-3
Date: 16 November 2015 10:04:06

Dear Sirs,

As a resident of the Horsforth and Rawdon area for some 35 years I would like to comment on the above site allocations in the new Leeds site allocation Plan as I believe they are **not Justified, not effective, not positively prepared** and in some cases **not in accordance with the NPPF**.

These allocations are **not Justified** as they will ultimately spoil the rural division between Horsforth and Rawdon and impact the character of Rawdon Village.

They also use green belt land designated within Leeds City Council's own designated Special Landscape Corridor which would result in the loss of farm land and natural habitat.

Particular sites HG2-12 and HG3-3 would also have detrimental impact on the Cragg Wood Conservation Area.

There has been no comprehensive greenbelt review as required under the Core Strategy.

The A65 which would have to serve these sites is already suffering from congestion despite recent attempts to alleviate it. These sites would be unsustainable and the A65 unable to cope with capacity.

This would be worsened by one-point access into HG2-12, HG3-2 and HG3-3 from unsuitable Knott Lane.

I believe these allocations are **not positively prepared** as the site allocations plan for the Rawdon sites are not based on a comprehensive greenbelt review as required by the previous Inspector when he passed the core strategy as sound.

I believe the proposed development sites are **not in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework** especially chapters 9 protecting greenbelt, 11 Conserving natural environment and 12 conserving historic environment.

By not considering alternatives the Council has not proved that '*exceptional circumstances*' exist to outweigh the harm that development would cause to the greenbelt sites here. The Council say that '*growth*' is the exceptional circumstance, but government ministers disagree. The selective (and *flawed*) greenbelt review undertaken by Leeds City Council means the Core Strategy and Site Allocations Plan are **UNSOUND**.

The Council has also not revised its housing target in response to the revised ONS projections which would mean the City needs 45,000 houses and not 70,000 on which the Council has its Core Strategy. If this were taken into account the need to use greenbelt land would be eliminated.

How can these plans be considered **Sustainable** in any sense when the loss of greenbelt, habitat, ecology, the increased traffic, noise and the inevitable loss of air quality that will result from this. I believe Under any process of '*sequential testing*' of these sites they would be proved to be **Unsustainable**.

Regards,

Sophie Sheard