

AD1100566

10 London Lane
Rawdon
Leeds
LS19 6BR
4th November 2015

LDF Publication Draft Consultation
Forward Planning & Implementation
The Leonardo Building
2 Rossington Street
Leeds
LS2 8HD

Re - Site Reference HG2-12 Woodlands Drive

DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT			
To	Action	Info	File

Dear Sir / Madam,

I am writing to object to the development of the site above.

As a resident of Rawdon for over 20 years I am appalled at the inclusion of so much of our green belt in Leeds City Councils Site Allocations Plans and this includes Woodlands Drive.

Why have the Council been allowed to introduce large Green Belt sites since the first draft site allocation? Misleading and factually incorrect, the whole proposal is unjustified, unsound and legally non-compliant -

Not Justified

-The site is within the historical setting of the Conservation Area of Cragg Wood. Woodlands Drive has stunning valley views and is within Leeds City Councils own designated Special Landscape Area.

Historic England - EXPERTS - state that the allocation of this site is an "UNSOUND" proposition for development. How can the Council be allowed to dismiss this important data?

"this site should not be allocated unless there are clear public benefits that outweigh the harm (as is required by NPPF, Paragraph 133 or 134)" Historic England in their details to LCC 21/10/15

- Resources are already stretched. Our schools, doctors, dentists are already struggling to cope and what about the impact on local roads, traffic levels? The Council seem to be very concerned about housing (and supporting house builders), but have no interest in delivering anything else to our communities.

- It creates urban sprawl and would ruin the identity and character of Rawdon, a village which is already being eroded away by development and proposals on either side.

- Leeds Country Way runs through this site and it's long been used as a space for the community - people dog walk, run, ramble. Leeds City Council's "Parks and Green Space Strategy" states that the Council recognizes the value of these places and their wellbeing. It's hypocritical and inconsistent to then bulldoze the green space in Aireborough.

- The development would completely destroy a wildlife rich habitat, wild deer, bats, sparrow hawks, tawny owls and kites and which is recognized as a UK Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitat. It's also important Grade 3 agricultural farmland. Is this justified?

- As at September 2015 (15,327) there are 15,327 empty properties city wide. (Data from LCC Data Mill).

The Core Strategy states that all Brownfield sites should be developed BEFORE greenbelt land. How can Leeds City Council justify using greenbelt when there are other opportunities for housing - land derelict, existing buildings. The Council is allowing developers to cherry pick the most desirable and profitable sites which means our green belt in Aireborough. There are sites elsewhere in our City - if it's for a genuine housing need then people will live where they can. And we need to look at improving these first.

Not Effective or Positively Prepared

- I didn't receive any literature nor was I aware of the Council Drop Ins. They were not sign posted on main roads and the information was incorrect in the library - Aire Valley NOT Aireborough? With 35% of the Leeds population omitted from this consultation because they are not on line, how can this be an effective way to share information of such importance? Personally I don't use on line facilities so how did you consult me?

- And how can a plan be positively prepared when it isn't based on a comprehensive Greenbelt Review as required under the Core Strategy.

Not Legally Compliant and not in accordance with the NPPF

- The housing target of 70,000 on which the Council has based its Core Strategy is inaccurate and factually WRONG. Leeds City Council has not revised these figures despite ONS projections of 45,000. The Council has also IGNORED the NPPF which states that green belt only be used in "exceptional circumstances". These are not exceptional circumstances and how can you claim "growth" when you cannot substantiate the figures?

- Site HG2-12 was NOT included in the Issues and Consultations consultation in June. Nor was there any consultation PRIOR to it being allocated to housing in the Site

Allocations Plan. What happened to the **Statement of Community Involvement** and why was this site suddenly introduced when it hadn't been included before. This is misleading a community and it's residents who live there.

-Section 9 of the NPPF serves to protect greenbelt and this is being ignored across Aireborough. How can this be ignored? It's unlawful.

Our green space is being used to meet unproven and obsolete targets. Sites are being allocated that contravene NPPF guidelines. How can our Council not be held to account for this? These sites are recognized by notable expert organisations and have been decreed green status for good reason and for Leeds City Council to even give consideration is disgraceful and driven by greed.

I am not a NIMBY, my objection is based on local knowledge, planning laws and a LOVE of where my family live. I have worked hard to live here and the very reasons that I sought to be part of this community are being threatened for no other reason than money.

I hope that the Council will take notice of the strength of feeling of residents and review this proposal immediately,

Regards,

Philip Ward