

From: [Daniel Rule](#)
To: [Site Allocations Plan](#)
Subject: PDE03195_Formal objections to LSAP & AVLAAP
Date: 16 November 2015 00:37:31

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing to strongly object to the developments proposed for the following greenbelt and greenfield sites:

1. HG2-41 (4240) - Fields South of A65 from Horsforth & Rawdon RA to crematorium
2. HG2-42 (1016) - Fields at Broadway and Calverley Lane, Horsforth
3. HG2-43 (5009) - Fields at Horsforth College Campus

I strongly object to the development of this site as it is designated green belt. The removal of this site from the green belt is contrary to National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Section 9, paragraph 80 because including the site for development fails the 5 tests of green belt purpose as follows:

1. INADEQUATE ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINT: It is stated in the NPPF that greenbelt development should be capped in line with brownfield development however in this instance the proposed development will substantially exceed this capacity is therefore contrary to the planning framework.
2. NON-EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCE: The NPPF states unless there are exceptional circumstances the greenbelt should be protected from development. Including this site simply to meet the current housing target is clearly not an exceptional circumstance.
3. PRIORITISATION OF GREENBELT OVER BROWN FIELD: NPPF states that brown field sites are to be prioritised over the development of green field and greenbelt. These greenbelt/greenfield sites are being put forward before the full utilisation of brownfield site.
4. LOSS OF COMMUNITY IDENTITY: NPPF states that merging of communities is to be prevented. It is very clear that the development of these sites, particularly the very large developments at sites HG2-41 and HG2-43, will result in the loss of identity between Horsforth, Rawdon and Rodley. The greenbelt/greenfield land forming the proposed developments listed above form a currently delineate these areas as separate communities and this would be lost.
5. LACK OF INFRASTRUCTURE: NPPF states that infrastructure must be prioritised. Infrastructure is not prioritised in these proposals due to the lack of concrete plans for healthcare, education and transport development in areas that are already

under significant pressure.

Negative impact on road safety

Despite the recent redevelopment work of several ring road junctions in the area the roads are still extremely congested. The addition of over a thousand houses would make this situation significantly worse and will significantly increase the risk of serious accidents.

Inability to cope with increase in traffic

As a local resident that uses the roundabout at the junction of the A65/A6120 everyday during the rush hour I can state that this is already a significant issue and one that would become unsustainable if the proposed developments take place. In addition the constraints placed on further transport infrastructure development by the railway, river and canal make this development unsound.

Destruction of habitats

A large area of greenbelt/greenfield land will be destroyed by these developments. The environmental impact assessments carried out thus far are inadequate and do not make any meaningful provision for the protection of the large number of species currently inhabiting these areas.

Destruction of natural views

I strongly object to the to development of site HG2-41 as not only is it greenbelt but when walking or driving on the A65, A6120, A657 and canal towpath the current landscape forms a green corridor stretching along the Aire valley towards Shipley. The proposed development would remove this essential aesthetic characteristic of the local environment.

As stated previously I strongly object to the proposals specified above and based on the issues outlined I do not consider that the Plan is sound as it is not consistent with national policy.

Yours faithfully,

Dr Daniel Rule