

Loss of any Green Belt at this stage of the Local Plan is to be opposed strongly and should be avoided; taking land out of Green Belt should not be done before the Leeds Local Plan has reached its halfway point on 1st April 2020, after a formal review of progress. This is to avoid unnecessary loss of Green Belt if new development, especially the need for dwellings, falls well short of LDF Core Strategy targets. According to the consultation document, development at Haighside should await public transport improvements such as the NGT trolleybus. NGT won't be ready until at least 2021, if at all, underlining the case for putting back consideration of this site until an LDF review in 2020 of all Green Belt sites proposed for release; meanwhile it should be pencilled into phase 3 to allow that delayed assessment to take place, or be rejected outright as development land.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 79 says "the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence"; para 83 says "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 regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so that they should be capable of enduring beyond the plan period". Leeds City Council must take this into account, so I object to the release of land at Haighside for development.

(Signed)

Also, I wish to add personal comments which are set out below.

Note: comments can be sent on-line to www.leeds.co.uk/yourcity, or by e-mail to sap@leeds.gov.uk. Comments, whether electronic or on paper, must be received by Leeds not later than 5pm on Monday 16th November 2015. Preferably, comments should quote the reference number and name of the allocation site to which they refer, if it has any, such as HG2-173, Haghside, Rothwell. There is no limit to the number of sites which can be commented on. Please continue overleaf and add more sheets of paper if needed. Anonymous comments cannot be accepted by Leeds, so always give clearly your name and postal or e-mail address.

Personal Comments, in addition to those highlighted above.

- I am a resident of Low Shops Lane, and am hugely concerned at the suggestion that access to this new site, would be through the end of my street. This is a family estate, and Low Shops Lane, is currently a dead end. Using this estate as an entrance to the new site, is thoughtless and highly impractical. The impacts would be huge and not fair on the local residents, who moved into this street because it was low traffic and safe for the majority of young families that live here. The increase in traffic would have numerous effects;

More wear and tear on the roads

Much higher volume of traffic, more exposure to dangerous drivers, speeding etc.

Greater difficulty in getting out of the estate onto Wood Lane, which is bad enough already. This is an existing problem, which no-one seems to want to address. Difficulty getting out of the estate onto Wood Lane, then difficulty leaving Wood Lane, to get onto Leeds Road, the main access route in Leeds/Wakefield from this position in Rothwell. Imagine adding an additional 500 road users to this already ridiculous situation. I believe, additional delays, due to increased volume, could potentially affect the residents' lives and well-being.

Due to the existing site being built on an existing colliery, I firmly believe that a high increase in traffic volume, and especially if work traffic were to use Low Shops Lane, that this would have a devastating impact on the stability of the ground and the stability of the houses built near the mine caps.

- Access to Schools, there is already a shortage of school places in this area, especially secondary schools. So the alternative allocation in Robin Hood clearly makes more sense, as this includes the provision of a school.
-