

PDHO 1760

DEVELOPMENT CONSULTATION			
To	Action	Info	File
16 NOV 2015			
File Name:			

Linfitt
Henley Mount
Rawdon
Leeds
LS19 6PX

13 November 2015

Leeds City Council
LDF Publication Draft Consultation
Planning and Implementation
The Leonardo Building
2 Rossington Street
Leeds
LS2 8HD

Dear Sirs

I write in connection with the proposed development plans for my local area of Rawdon in particular and the surrounding area in general.

The overall additional housing target of Leeds City Council is based on forecasts which are derived from statistics which according to my information are at least 8 years old if not more. Assuming an average of two people per house (it is probably more) the target of an extra 140,000 extra people in the next 12 years is excessive and a more reasonable forecast should be undertaken based on current data. The target does not appear to include any flexibility which I understand has to be incorporated into any Local Plan.

Please register my opposition to the current proposals on the grounds that the stated housing requirement is flawed.

The number of sites on land designated as Green Belt disregards the purpose of the designation. The Core Strategy appears to be contradictory in that it seeks to minimise Greenfield and Green Belt usage whilst all the major sites in my local area are currently Greenfield and Green Belt. The housing need cannot be regarded as "exceptional" to warrant Green Belt sacrifice, it is the normal expansion of a city. One of the purposes of Green Belt is to prevent the merging of adjacent communities - the proposals effectively merge Rawdon and Horsforth. If a recent Green Belt review has taken place and "the community" consulted I am not aware of it as someone who takes an interest in local matters.

Please register my opposition to the current proposals on the grounds that the Green Belt was and is designated as such for a purpose and the Core Strategy to minimise Greenfield and Green Belt usage should be adhered to.

Leeds City Council has as far as I am aware has no policy to only grant permission to build on Greenfield, let alone Green Belt sites once **all** brownfield sites are developed. All developers will choose the easy option where no remediation is potentially necessary.

The sites as proposed will add to the congestion on the A65 west of the ring road which is getting worse by the week. The A65 / A6120 junction is not capable of

handling any additional load without further and considerable investment (with its attendant disruption) to the junction and for a considerable mileage on both roads either side of the junction. Emergency vehicles currently have difficulty in passing through the junction, additional traffic will not improve the situation.

Please register my opposition to the current proposals on the grounds that the current road infrastructure is not capable of dealing with any extra traffic in a safe and efficient manner.

The sites as proposed do not incorporate any provision for any additional amenities such as a park, leisure centre, shops/ supermarket or medical facilities. The assumption must therefore be that the existing facilities at Horsforth or Yeadon must have spare capacity. This is at best questionable. If spare capacity exists at supermarkets it is not at a time or day when the average person wishes to use them. Please register my opposition to the current proposals on the grounds that the local amenities cannot cope with the extra load.


The Aire Valley is a green corridor with a good variety of wildlife and habitats their loss has not been addressed in the proposals

The field footpaths are well used and have a rural feel to them – their loss will put extra pressure on those that remain. The fact that the whole area is not predominantly built upon adds to the well being of the local population. This semi rural aspect is one reason why Leeds is seen as a good place to live unlike west of the Pennines where the urban sprawl continues from town to town unabated.

Please register my opposition to the current proposals on the grounds that the loss of green amenity and habitat has not been properly addressed.

In conclusion the whole plan is based on a false premise, is ill thought out and should be discarded. The local community does not see a need for it nor want it.

Yours faithfully


CW Jagger 