

PDH 01854

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

To	Action	Info	File

13 Southlands Ave.
Rawdon
Leeds
LS19 6JN

12 November 2015

OBJECTIONS TO LEEDS SITE ALLOCATION PLANS

Dear Sir/Madam,

As a resident of this area for nearly 34 years I would like to make objection to the Leeds Site Allocation Plans for the following sites

HG2-12
HG2-41
HG2-42
HG2-43

This objection is not nimbyism, it is common sense on the grounds of :

saving the Greenbelt,
preventing loss of community identity and urban sprawl,
inadequate infrastructure .

The details of my objections will be in line with 'Your city. Your Plan – Response form'

Ecology

A definition of ecology is '*the study of the interaction between organisms and the environment*'. HG2-12 are '*UK Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitats*' as well as housing development on HG2-41/42/43 in conjunction with the developed site HG1-96/97 would effectively sever the green corridor from Leeds along the Aire Valley. This restricts the territorial and migratory habits of wild life.

Local Services

The existing local services such as schools, healthcare and amenities are at full stretch and oversubscribed at present. There are currently no provisions for new schools or healthcare for the large increase of 3000+ population. There may be token attempts to set aside land for education but no consideration for who is to build these schools. In all probability the builders will plead loss of profit and none viability and build yet more houses.

Conservation.

Definition '*Careful utilisation natural resources in prevent depletion*. HG2-12 and HG2-41 are distinctive open valley views and are part of the Rawdon village and Leeds/Bradford Green

corridor. Both sites are designated by LCC as '*Special Landscape Areas*'. Building on these sites would mean that the intrinsic nature of this area would be lost forever. The '*Leeds Country Way*' runs through HG2-12. It would not be much of a country way running through a housing estate! The site HG2-12 and HG2-41 are valuable Grade 3 agricultural land. The former is well used by a local farmer for grazing cattle and sheep. The latter, known locally as the Strawberry Fields, provide valuable employment and for local residents, and leisure for a wider population.

Loss of Greenbelt

Possibly the most controversial aspect of this the allocation plan. There are several inconsistencies with the National Planning Policy Framework, NPPF, namely

Prevention of Urban Sprawl

The three sites provide separation between urban areas of Horsforth Rawdon and Yeadon. Looking at a map will show that building on these sites will link these areas into one and provide ammunition for future arguments for widening this link for even more developments over even more green belt land.

Protection of the Greenbelt.

The NPPF states that it requires exceptional circumstances to be able to build on the Greenbelt. Meeting housing targets is not an exceptional circumstance but just a part of the Council's scheduled building policy plan. The Council has not stated that exceptional circumstances exist which would cause the Greenbelt to be used. This Framework also states that Brownfield sites are to be used before Greenfield and Greenbelt land. The three sites above have been allocated in advance of Brownfield ones. The current plans disregard the statement of NPPF that says that the target level of housing should be to that which can be accommodated by using Brownfield sites in order to protect the Greenbelt.

Highways and Transport.

It is well known locally and nationally with many reports on the radio of the congestion on the A65 from Guiseley to Leeds. The road is over subscribed at the present time having had to absorb vehicles from new housing development over recent years, namely the Silvercross, Crompton and Highroyds development in Guiseley. The introduction of 800 -1000 houses in this area and its attendant 1200 – 1500 cars would make this important link unsustainable. The congestion would be relieved by widening the A65 but various pinch points would remain negating the overall effect. The recent improvements to local roundabouts will only partially alleviate the present day congestion. Future development in Menston on the Leeds /Bradford boundary and in Yeadon will overwhelm this road. The Ring Road A1620 adjacent to HG2-41/42/43 cannot be widened because it crosses three bridges over a canal, railway and a river. The ongoing development at Horsforth Vale with 500 houses will put another 200+ cars on this road at peak times.

On a more immediate local level, the access to site HG2-12 via Knott Lane is inadequate because of its width, its alignment with the A65, frequent use by crematorium traffic and unofficial use as a park and ride by commuters to Leeds. Access onto the A65 is dangerous

at present and would be almost impossible with further Increase in traffic from significant new housing developments.

Questions to be answered

Do I consider the plan to be sound.?

In short **NO**; for the reasons given above.

Is the Plan Positively Prepared?

The Plan has not been positive prepared. There is no regional co-ordination. There is a large Greenbelt development planned in the Bradford on the border with Leeds in Menston. Little consideration has been given to the effect this will have on commuter traffic on the the roads through Guiseley, Yeadon, Rawdon, Horsforth and on to Leeds. There are large swathes of brown field sites across Bradford, Halifax and Wakefield which should be used first before the Greenbelt in this area. There are large Brownfield sites to the south of Leeds with suitable major road infrastructure to accommodate a new city. !!

The sites identified above are, according to Council documentation, on Greenbelt land. Not only are the use of the sites contradictory with national policy but the councils own declared policy of protecting valued landscapes, ecosystems and biodiversities. It is said that a Greenbelt review was prepared in 2013 on these sites but a negligible few have heard of or seen it since it was buried in other council documentation and were unable to give comments

Is the Plan Effective.

As mentioned earlier the site access to phase 2 site HG2-12 is poor and recent discussion with Planning Officers indicates that Knott Lane will have to re-aligned with the A65. The re-alignment is also dependent upon Phase 3 Safe guarded sites HG3-2 and HG3-3. But HG2-12 Has been allocated for houses before sites HG3-2/3 . Therefore HG2-12 has been incorrectly allocated and the plan not effective

Is the Plan Justified.

The Housing Targets of some 66,000 houses which has driven the need to develop on Greenbelt land was based on out of date, over inflated statistics of 2008. The target needs to be adjusted to be in line with 2014 figures of the Office of National Statistics which indicates that there is only 46,000 houses needed. A revised target needs to be considered to be put in place before the Allocation Plan is presented, thereby preventing the unnecessary destruction of Greenbelt land.

Is the plan Consistent with National Policies

There is a need for affordable housing and single owner properties a large scale. These will be needed for lower paid workers and older people wishing to downsize thereby releasing larger properties. This will not be achieved by building on greenbelt sites but on the

Brownfield land in need of urban regeneration. Housing on four sites listed above would demand multi bedroom, low density, high property values in excess of £350,000 as in the currently developed site at Horsforth Vale. The small fraction of affordable house earmarked for these higher valued areas would do little to alleviate the affordable housing problem.

These are own comments and objection and I sincerely hope they will be useful to in rejecting the development plan in its present form.

Yours Faithfully

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of Andrew Barber.

Andrew Barber