

PDF100569

| DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT | | | |
|------------------------|--------|------|------|
| To | Action | Info | File |
| | | | |
| - 9 NOV 2015 | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Meadow Bank Cottage
 Springwood Road
 Rawdon
 Leeds
 LS19 6BH

4 November 2015

LDF Publication Draft Consultation
 Leonardo Building
 2 Rossington Street
 Leeds
 LS2 8HD

Dear Sirs

I am writing to object in the strongest terms to allow building in Green Belt areas of Leeds, particularly around my local area of Rawdon. These sites are at:

- HG2-12, Fields at Woodlands Drive, Rawdon
- HG3-2, HG3-3, HG3-4, fields off of A65, Rawdon
- HG2-41 Fields south of A65, Horsforth roundabout to the crematorium
- HG2-43, fields at Horsforth College campus
- HG2-10, fields south of A65 at Yeadon
- HG2-9, fields next to Leeds Bradford Airport

I note from the Planning Practice Guidance that:

'79. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to *prevent urban sprawl* by keeping land *permanently* open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their *permanence*.

80. Green Belt serves five purposes:
- . to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas;
 - . to prevent neighbouring towns merging with one another;
 - . to assist in safeguarding the country side from encroachment;
 - . to preserve the setting and special character of historic town; and
 - . to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

83. Local planning authorities with Green Belts in their area should establish Green Belt boundaries in their Local Plans which set the framework for Green Belt and settlement policy. Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in *exceptional* circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. At that time, authorities should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regards to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period.

Online Planning Practice Guidance issued by the Government in March 2014 aimed to make clear that 'unmet housing *need is unlikely to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt* and other harm to constitute the very special circumstances justifying inappropriate development on a site within the Green Belt. It is for local authorities to define and maintain Green Belt land in their local areas. The Government expects local planning authorities in the Local Plans which set the framework for Green Belt and settlement policy. It also makes clear that the construction of new buildings should be regarded as '*inappropriate*' for the Green belt. The NPPF guidance sets out that unmet housing need in a particular area is unlikely to meet the 'very special circumstances' test to justify Green Belt development. The aim of the guidance was to reaffirm local authority's abilities to 'safeguard their local area against urban sprawl, and *protect the green lungs* around towns and cities.' From the NPPF, 'Need alone is not the only factor to be considered when drawing up the local plan. Green Belt boundaries should only be

altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan. At that time, authorities should consider the Green Belt boundaries having regard to their *intended permanence in the long term*, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period.'

The Leeds City Council proposal to include the above Green belt sites is clearly NOT consistent with the national policy.

The proposals HG2-41, HG2-42, HG3-3, HG3-2 and HG20-10 are located along the A65, so that they will further connect Horsforth to Rawdon to Yeadon, in one continuous ribbon development.

HG2-43, HG2-42 and HG2-41 will close the link corridor along the Aire valley to wildlife migration and diversity. HG1-96 and HG1-97 are both large sites and well into construction and occupation, but are on brown field sites and therefore less obtrusive and detrimental to wildlife migration. The Council should follow the Governments guidance that Councils should make the best use of previously developed land, whilst protecting the openness of the Green Belt in line with requirements of the NPPF.'

The proposal to use Green Belt land before other brownfield sites is NOT justified.

'Green Belt land is supposed to be kept in reserve for an open space, most often around larger cities. 'The main purpose of the Green Belt policy is to protect the land around larger urban centres from urban sprawl, and maintain the designated area for forestry and agriculture as well as to provide habitat to wildlife.

Its advantages by far outweigh its disadvantage. The UK government therefore encourages local authorities to protect the land around towns by creating Green Belts.

Green Belt policy has been shown to have a number of positive effects since their implementation.

The Campaign for the Protection of Rural England warns against the revision of current boundaries.

And the 2010 Natural England and CPRE report, 'Green Belts: A greener future', concluded Green Belt policy was 'highly effective' in its principal purpose, but called for 'more ambition' to further enhance the Green Belt protection *for future generations*.'

Also according to the CPRE the permanence of Green Belt boundaries is crucial for both the environment and the preservation of rural areas.

In 2010, Natural England and the CPRE published a report, 'Green Belt: A greener future'. This included fresh evidence on the benefits which Green Belt land is developing and how these relate to the ecosystem services they provide.' The report called for more ambition to further enhance the Green Belt protection for future generations: Quite separate from the debate about the location of housing growth, this report emphasises the need for multi-functional use of land, particularly in the face of climate change and population growth. 'Green infrastructure' within and around town and cities has an important role to play. Green Belt land is already making a contribution which could have even a greater significance in the future if it is managed effectively to maximise the benefits that a natural environment can deliver.'

The proposal to use this Strategic Green Infrastructure goes against the Leeds Core Strategy.

~~Further the introduction of further housing in this area will only lead to further increased traffic congestion. The current 'bottlenecks' occur at the very points where new housing is proposed along the A65. The proposed very large developments would cause major disruption during the construction phases and continue when the houses were occupied. Whenever there are roadworks or there is an accident or severe weather in the area there is always gridlock. Additional housing would only exacerbate this.~~

The proposals to add further housing in Rawdon and Yeadon will also increase the strain on schools. There are already insufficient spaces. My granddaughter started primary school this term but was unable to gain a place in her preferred two schools. Clearly additional housing can only make this worse. I note that proposal HG2-41 does include an allocation for schools, but that zone is in Horsforth and not Rawdon/Yeadon.

Yours faithfully

Trevor Jones