

PDH0249

DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT			
To	Action	Info	File
13 NOV 2015			

3 South Wood Mews
 Rawdon
 Leeds LS196SE
 11.11.15

Dear Sir,

I object to the proposed development of the sites, HQ2-12 Woodlands Drive, HQ2-41 Rawdon Crematorium - Horseforth Roundabout, HQ3-2 Knott Lane West, HQ3-3 Knott Lane East and HQ3-4 Layton Lane. HQ2-12, HQ3-2 and HQ2-41 are prime agricultural land that could provide food for the increasing population. Plans need to be made on how to feed, not only house and to designate this land for housing before brown field sites would be incredibly short sighted. Leeds City Council Core Strategy states itself that all brown field sites must be developed before green belt land. Also the Council has not revised its housing target in response to revised ONS projections which would mean the city needs 45,000 and not the current target of 70,000 on which the Council based its Core Strategy. A reduction in target of 15,000 houses alone would remove the need to take any land

out of the green belt.

Do not underestimate the dreadful loss being dealt to the next generation. Loss of the Special Land Area - the Council's own title for the area, in particular HQ2-12 and HQ2-41. Loss of the Rawdon Cragg Wood Conservation Area as HQ2-12 runs along side it, vital green belt, strategic green infrastructure providing recreation in the form of walking, cycling, horse-riding & general relaxation. Loss of wild life habitats for wild deer, bats, weasels, fieldfare, lapwing, curlew, sparrowhawks, tawny owls, red kites woodpeckers palmate newts and many more. HQ2-12, HQ3-3 and HQ3-4 are UK Biodiversity Plan (BAP) Priority Habitats and HQ3-2 is adjacent to a BAP Priority Habitat Pond. Loss of a blue bell wood in HQ3-3 and perhaps loss of protected mature trees. This loss would be outrageous when brown field sites are available and ONS projections indicate no need to take green belt.

The A65 is already failing to cope with the traffic. Despite so called road improvement there is extensive queuing

up to the Horsforth Roundabout causing, pollution delay and frustration. Concentrating more development along the ABS would be a disaster and could only end in complete grid lock at the ring road if HQ2-41 with a school goes ahead. It would be made even worse by one point access into HQ2-12, HQ3-2 and HQ3-3 from the unsuitable Knott Lane.

I believe any development would not be effective. The highways access to HQ2-12 is contingent on the development of the 'safeguarded' sites HQ3-2 and HQ3-3. However HQ2-12 is allocated for delivery earlier than these 3 sites. It has been incorrectly categorised as allocated and cannot be delivered. HQ2-12 has only one access point into the site via Southlands Avenue as other roads are private, inadequate for 130 houses frequent Crematorium traffic also uses Knott Lane (again traffic queuing) affecting all three sites.

HQ2-12, HQ3-2 and HQ3-3 would collectively require realignment of Knott Lane but would not serve them all adequately. Access issues onto the congested ABS would remain and further deteriorate with the increased traffic from the significant

housing development.

Of all the sites why has HQ2-12 already been allocated? There was no consultation prior to it being allocated to the housing in Site Allocation Plan and was not included in the Issues and Options consultation in June and so is not compliant with the Statement of Community Involvement. Add to the above that HQ2-12 is

1. A Special Land Scope Area.
 2. Development would spoil Cragg Wood Conservation Area.
 3. Leeds Country Way runs through it providing recreation
 4. It is a wild-life habitat.
 5. It is Grade 3 farm land.
 6. It scored -7 in its sustainability
 7. It has been allocated earlier than HQ3-2 and HQ3-3 although highway access is contingent on their development
 8. It has significant surface water flooding.
- It is astounding that it is allocated. This should be investigated.

I believe development has not been positively prepared: Site Allocations Plan for These Rawdon

Files are not based on a comprehensive Green belt review as required by the previous Inspector when he passed the Core Strategy as sound. The selective (and flawed) green belt review undertaken by Leeds City Council means the Core Strategy and Site Allocations plan are unsound.

I believe development is not in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) especially chapters 9 Protecting Green belt, 11 Conserving Natural Environment and 12 Conserving Historic Environment.

By not considering alternatives, the Council has not proved 'exceptional circumstances' exist to outweigh the harm development would cause to the green belt sites here. The Council say that 'growth' is the exceptional circumstance but the people of Rawdon, Horsforth and indeed government minister disagree.

Development is not justified, not effective, not legally compliant, not positively prepared and not in accordance with the NPPF

Yours sincerely

LESLIE GEORGE FARNCOM