project, dermit from the constraint of the const	A	lafo	F17.5
The second of th		The second section is a second section of the second section in the second section is a second section in the second section in the second section is a second section in the second section in the second section is a sec	
and the state of t	A second of the second of the second		The state of the s
	4 3 1	57 200	
	# {} · !		a control to the control of the statement of the statement
and worked to be a suppression of the superior of the suppression of the suppression of the superior of	mang par antight substitute and the section of the		
THE RESERVE THE PROPERTY OF THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TWO IS NOT THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TWO IS NAMED IN THE PERSON NAMED IN THE P	Marie Andrea and London (Proportional Proportional States of the Control of the C	and the second of the second o	Solve alternatives or control texts a minimum part.
	T-Agents		La company and the company of the co
	and reserve and reserve and reserve	and the second s	, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,

Robin Horsfall, 60 Victoria Mount, Horsforth, Leeds, LS18 4PX.

11th November, 2015.

Dear Sirs,



Leeds City Council Site Allocation Consultation.

I wish to lodge my objections to Leeds' Plan and the use of Green Belt Land for the following reasons:-

- 1. The proposed use of Green Belt land for housing development is inconsistent with paragraphs, 79, 80, 82, 87 of the NPPF. The Government states that Green Belt are essential to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land <u>permanently open.</u>
- 2. The NPPF also states that local planning should MINIMISE the impact on biodiversity. (see Chapter 11 of NPPF:109)
- 3. Leeds Core Strategy defines Green Belt to be permanently open or largely undeveloped and yet the plan appears to be targeting this very area, instead of looking to Brownfield sites in other areas of the City which would be in keeping with national strategy.
- 4. Leeds City Council has overestimated the need for housing and is using obsolete target figures. This is inconsistent with the national policy and Leeds Core Strategy. The figures should be revised and future planning adjusted accordingly.
- 5. There would also be a devastating loss of valuable Grade 3 Agricultural land in HG2-12, HG3-2 and HG2-41. These areas a regularly farmed. HG3-3 is a family smallholding and an apiary. All extremely valuable to the environment with regard to food production and wildlife habitat.
- 6. Sites HG2-12, HG3-3, HG3-4 are all UK Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitats and should NEVER be developed. Again, inconsistent with NPPF.
- 7. HG3-3 contains a Native Bluebell wood (protected species) and HG3-2 is adjacent to UK BAP Priority Habitat pond with palmate newts. AGAIN SHOULD NEVER BE DEVELOPED. Again- inconsistent the NPPF
- 8. Brownfield Sites in other areas of the city MUST BE DEVELOPED BEFORE GREENBELT LAND in accordance with the LCC Core Strategy.

There have been errors in the methodology of assessments of the impact of green belt development..

- 1. No thorough review has taken place.
- 2. The flooding in the area has not been taken into consideration
- 3. The loss of public recreational amenity has been ignored Leeds Country Way, walking, horse-riding, cycling etc.
- 4. The A65, already at capacity during peak times, would become gridlocked and dangerous. (the "improvements" at Broadway roundabout have done nothing to speed up traffic flow)
- 5. There appears to have been no liaison with Bradford council regarding their proposed developments, which would impact on the A65.
- 6. There are not enough school places in the area and local public services, such as GPs, would be put under extreme pressure.

The development is not legally compliant, not positively prepared and not in accordance with the NPPF.

Yours sincerely,

Robin Horsfall