

PDH 01153

10 Rawdon Road
Horsforth
LEEDS
LS18 5DZ
10/11/15

LEEDS CITY COUNCIL DEPARTMENT			
DATE	ACTION	INTO	FILE
12 NOV 2015			

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

Re: LEEDS SITE ALLOCATION PLANS – FORMAL OBJECTION

Dear Sir/Madam,

As part of the Leeds Site Allocation Plan public consultation process I would like to formally object to the proposed development of the following sites:

- HG2-41 (4240) – Fields South of A65 from Horsforth & Rawdon RA to crematorium
- HG2-42 (1016) – Fields at Broadway and Calverley Lane, Horsforth
- HG2-43 (5009) - Fields at Horsforth College Campus
- HG2-12 (4254) – Fields at Woodland’s Drive

It is my belief that these proposed development sites are NOT consistent with the national policy, specifically with regard to Green Belt. Section 9 of the NPPF is entitled Protecting Green Belt Land. Paragraph 79 states that “The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts” and that “The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belt are their openness and their permanence”. I believe the use of large sections of local Green Belt is inconsistent with this paragraph. Leeds must continue to protect our Green Belt and greenfields.

Paragraph 80 states “Green Belt serves five purposes:

- to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns;
- to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land”.

I believe that use of local Green Belt sites ignores several of the above purposes and is therefore inconsistent with national policy. Development of these sites will lead to nearby villages being engulfed within the ‘Main Urban

Area' and they will no longer be separate 'Major Settlements' of their own. Part of the reason for buying the house I live in was because of the 'village-like' area. Had I wanted to live in an urban sprawl I would have bought a house in the centre of the city and not Horsforth. In preparing its site allocation proposal Leeds has completely disregarded the fifth purpose which I believe makes the whole process inconsistent with national policy.

The fields and open green spaces, which are being proposed for development, are important to me and my family. I live directly opposite the fields HG2-41 which are currently Pick Your Own Fruit fields and working agricultural land, and at present have the feeling of being out in the countryside without having to travel whenever I look out of my bedroom window, with our high hedge masking the constant traffic on the A65 and the trees on the far side of the field masking the Ring Road. This view of the natural landscape stretching through the Aire Valley towards the distant hills of Shipley Glen would be completely destroyed if development on this site went ahead thus creating a negative effect on the landscape. If this Green Belt site were to be built on it would have a detrimental effect on my wellbeing.

Chapter 11 of the sustainable development section of the NPPF paragraph 109 states "The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

- Protecting and enhancing valued landscapes...
- Recognising the wider benefits of ecosystem services;
- Minimising impacts on biodiversity..."

I believe the use of these above proposed sites is inconsistent with this aspect of national policy. I often see wild deer, fox, squirrel, pheasant and kestrel in this area and they will perish as a result of the proposed development. The above sites provide a continuous chain of greenbelt along the Aire Valley, which allows the wildlife migratory and residential access across the region. The destruction of these sites will lead to their isolation, hemmed in by the proposed housing and Ring Road, leading to their permanent demise from the area. The wildlife must be protected from loss of habitat so that present and future generations can continue to enjoy them.

Leeds council have set a target of 70,000 new houses which is 35% more than the latest housing estimates from the 2014 Office of National Statistics, which state a need of only 46,000 houses. A survey by professional planning specialists in 2014 on behalf of Leeds City Council concluded that Brownfield sites across Leeds could supply 90% of the housing needs based on the volumes identified in the recent 2014 data. I believe these sites should be developed first which would take away the need to use the above Green Belt sites, in accordance with Government Policy which states that "Brownfield sites must be developed before Green Belt and greenfield sites".

There are huge swathes of post industrial, derelict brown field sites that lay undeveloped in the neighbouring satellite towns. These ideally suited sites across Bradford, Halifax and Wakefield should first accommodate the excess housing capacity volumes, before the Greenbelt sites of Leeds are

considered. This shows a lack of co-operation with neighbouring councils and no coherent regional co-ordination.

It is my understanding that the proposed development sites are NOT consistent with the national policy, specifically with regard to infrastructure. Leeds has insufficient policies in place to address the issues that these developments will generate. There are currently no plans to solve traffic problems along the affected areas of the A65 and the city does not have a solution for more traffic crossing the river, canal or railway on the Ring Road. All three bridges would have to be replaced before any road widening could take place. Development and infrastructure must be considered side by side.

In the Glossary of Leeds Core Strategy it defines Green Belt as follows: 'A designation for areas of open land around certain cities and large built-up areas where strict planning controls apply to keep this land permanently open or largely undeveloped'. It also restates the five purposes of Green Belt. I believe that not only is the site allocation inconsistent with national policy, it is also inconsistent with Leeds' own established policy.

As you can see I have major concerns about the development of these sites and I sincerely hope that you will act on my behalf and reject the use of these Green Belt sites. Please keep me informed of the public examinations, submission of the plans and potential outcome of the review as I would like to retain my right to attend and speak.

Yours faithfully

Mrs C V Darlow

